

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXVIII.]

OCTOBER, 1854.

[Vol. X.

## THE BROKEN PLEDGE OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.\*

WE suppose the subject here hinted cannot be quite new to any of the more zealous members of the Unitarian body, though the details of religious fraud and cunning which fill up the page may have been very imperfectly retained in most of our minds, scattered as they are over many years, and glozed and varnished as they have been by various pens and tongues. Though it is assuredly no pleasant task to point at public immoralities, and, least of all, those which are perpetrated in the name of a conscientious zeal for saving faith, it seems a kind of duty resting upon us, as advocates not simply of Unitarian views of religious faith, but also of what everybody understands by *good faith* between man and man, to present in clear summary the "round unvarnished tale" to our readers,

"Whereof by parcels they have something heard,  
But not intently."

They will see by "what conjuration and what mighty magic" this Society, guided by their redoubtable Secretary, has "won" its present unenviable position among the promoters of popular education.

It is perfectly notorious to the older friends of popular education, that at the beginning of the present century Joseph Lancaster originated a system of popular education, the distinctive aim of which was to extend its benefits as widely and cheaply as possible, without offence to the religious feelings of any body of Christians. He endeavoured to secure the latter object by using selections from the authorized version of the Scriptures, and by selecting the parts most suitable to the intelligence and feeling

\* Mr. Henry Dunn's Reply to the Misrepresentations of Rev. F. Close and others on the British and Foreign School Society. 1839.

The Factories Bill Rejected, &c., by Henry Dunn, Secretary to British and Foreign School Society. 1843.

Has the British and Foreign School Society kept Faith with the Public? by Rev. G. Armstrong. 1847.

Case. As to the Present Management of the British and Foreign School Society (not published). 1847.

Letter to Henry Dunn, Esq., on the Management of the British and Foreign School Society, by Rev. S. Wood. 1848.

Letter to James Heywood, Esq., M.P., on the "Case," &c., by H. Dunn. 1848.

Reports of Unitarian Association, 1846—1854.

of childhood, which are of course the easiest, simplest and least debateable parts of the sacred volume. The Roman Catholics in England were at that time so few as hardly to offer a practical difficulty to this plan on the ground of *version*; nor indeed, at that day, was it customary among them to urge the reading of the Scriptures, in any English version, upon their poor laity. The Church of England, under Dr. Bell's guidance, soon formed a separate system of schools for their poor; and thus the name Lancasterian became an equivalent to "School for Protestant Dissenters of all Denominations."

It is perfectly notorious that, among the various denominations, there were no more ardent and generous supporters of Lancaster's schools, from their very commencement, than the Presbyterians and Unitarians. Everywhere throughout the kingdom this was the conspicuous and acknowledged fact.

Lancaster found it up-hill work, however, to sustain his various schools, until, in 1811, the British and Foreign School Society (under a slightly different name) was founded.

"In the year 1811, an Address was published by a Committee formed for promoting the Royal Lancasterian System of Education. It was signed by the Duke of Bedford and Lord Somerville as Presidents, and in it the following very distinct and important declaration occurs:

"For the particular methods pursued in Mr. Lancaster's Plan of Education we must refer to his own publications. *One regulation* it is necessary to state, in order to obviate the scruples which Parents and Guardians attached to any particular form of Christianity might feel with respect to the Religious instruction imparted in Mr. Lancaster's Schools; and in order to extend the benefits of his Plan of Education to all the religious denominations of the community, it is an inviolable law to teach nothing but what is the standard of belief to all Christians—the *Scriptures themselves*; the children, while not only taught to read the Bible, but trained in the habit of reading it, being left entirely to the explanations and commentaries which their parents or friends may think it their duty to give them at home.'

"1812. In the Report of the Finance Committee of the Royal British or Lancasterian Education Society it is stated, 'that in the Lancasterian Schools the object of instruction is the Holy Scriptures, a basis on which *Christians of every name* can meet, this system being calculated to unite the exertions and concentrate the supplies of every persuasion.'

"1813. At the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Royal British or Lancasterian Educational Society, the fundamental rules of the Society were drawn up, the Duke of Kent in the chair.

"The following is the Fourth Rule as it now exists, repeated in all the Reports:

"All Schools which shall be supplied with Teachers at the expense of this Institution shall be open to the *children of parents of all religious denominations*. Reading, Writing, Arithmetic and Needlework shall be taught; the Lessons for Reading shall consist of Extracts from the Holy Scriptures: no Catechism or peculiar



religious tenets shall be taught in the Schools; but every child shall be enjoined to attend regularly the place of worship to which its parents belong.'

"It was also agreed, that in order more fully to set forth its object and character, the Institution should be designated 'The Institution for promoting the British System of Education of the Labouring and Manufacturing Classes of Society of every religious persuasion.' This title was found cumbrous, and

"In 1814 these Rules were confirmed, and the Institution took the name of the 'British and Foreign School Society.'

"The Report of the Society states, that 'the Institution gives no countenance to the peculiar doctrines of any sect. It recommends the reading of the Bible, following in this the direction of our Saviour—'Search the Scriptures, for they are they that testify of me.'

"The Institution is 'founded on this simple and comprehensive principle, that it may not exclude the aid of any persons professing to be Christians.' And in the Resolutions prefixed to this Report, the Duke of Sussex in the chair, is one to the following effect:

"That the plan of this Institution (which does not exclude children or persons of any religious sect, but affords religious instruction *without prescribing or rejecting the peculiar creed of any religious party*, literally opening the door of education to all) has our cordial, *deliberate and confirmed* approbation.'" (Case, pp. 3—5.)

Nothing can be plainer, nothing more truly Christian, than these avowals. And in the days in which they were made, there was no difficulty in carrying them into effect with perfect mutual faith and great public benefit. Those were the days, indeed, which certain more modern religionists, calling themselves Evangelical *par excellence*, now look back upon as days of religious darkness and error,—days when human virtues sadly stood in the place of supernatural graces, and the kindly suggestions of the natural human heart were trusted without shame, leading men to co-operate in the name alike of their common humanity and their common religion, without nicely testing each other's orthodoxy or heterodoxy. Since those days, a revival of religion is believed to have taken place. The "doctrines of grace" have superseded the human charities. Evangelical orthodoxy has taken rank above virtue and good morals. The good works of benevolence have been found to be "filthy rags" upon the shoulders of heretics, and to gain their true odour of sanctity only through the inspiration of the saving faith. The "saints" have wondered how they and their fathers could be so long blind to the iniquity of co-operating with Unitarians and Infidels in works of charity and public spirit. They have repudiated all connection with such persons for the future, beyond intimating a willingness still to receive their pecuniary benefactions, and disburse them in such a manner as may correct the evil principles of their donors.

There has been a good deal of pure fanaticism in this process,

but something besides. Where property has been concerned, and the new "Evangelical" zeal (what a perversion of a once holy word!) has considered it a religious duty to dispossess Unitarians of their share in its administration, the most generous concession we can make to the religious sincerity of the monopolists, is only another way of saying that their fanaticism destroys their perception of the rights of *meum* and *tuum*.

The Orphan-Road School was the scene of the first conspicuous efforts of this intolerant spirit, when the Trinitarian Dissenters found (after sinning many years in ignorance) that they could not conscientiously preach in the same pulpit as Unitarians; and so, exercising the power of the majority to test truth and right by numbers, they effectually turned the Unitarians out of the administration of that charity, from which their own consciences forbade them quietly to withdraw themselves. Though we speak of Trinitarian Dissenters collectively, here and throughout, in describing the public acts of those bodies, let it be put upon honourable record that the best men among themselves always protested, though in vain, against the unrighteous deeds of the rest. It is the unhappy but seemingly necessary fate of churches founded on orthodox tests, that zealots for the creed have always the upper hand over those who merely advocate right and justice and charity. The latter are always sure to be suspected of being heretics in their hearts, and are plainly pointed out for that questionable interpretation by those stronger spirits who have no doubts, scruples or forbearance of any kind themselves, and who always assert for themselves the leading place in the conduct of religious affairs; while the mass of good, well-meaning, but feeble-spirited men who form the bulk of such assemblies (as of many others), are swayed by the power of these leaders to give their numerical votes for the coarse visible support of an orthodox wrong, rather than for a right that may possibly tend to favour heresy. This is no less sad than true. The most thoughtful and most faithful men are pushed into the back-ground, and the religious agencies in question are represented by the coarser and more pragmatical spirits, who think orthodoxy a sufficient qualification for leadership, and find it so.

The history of the Orphan-Road School was, on a small scale, the perpetration of plunder (for religion's sake!), which the Hewley suit, then in progress, on a larger scale, presently sanctioned as legal, as well as righteous; and then the further spoiling of the goods of the heretics by their orthodox brethren was contemplated on a more general scale, when the hand of secular justice interposed (in 1844) in the Dissenters' Chapels Act. Now it was not in human nature, whether redeemed or unredeemed, whether sanctified or carnal, in the religious cant of the aggressors, that any strong mutual sympathy in works of common charity should be felt henceforth between those whose religion prompted



them to seize their neighbours' property, and those whose hearts told them they were suffering robbery by defect of law. Accordingly, there came to be less and less cordiality between orthodox and Unitarian Dissenters,—more particularly as the Dissenting claims were, by this time, pretty fully conceded, and there was no longer any motive of palpable worldly prudence to keep the Three Denominations in seeming unison.

It was through the same general influences that the more orthodox portion of the conductors of the British and Foreign School Society had begun, about the same period, to feel scruples of conscience as to the propriety of continuing to co-operate with Unitarians in that institution, and of remaining satisfied with conducting it on the unsectarian principles hitherto adopted. They seem to have had no conscientious scruples about violating the trusts on which it was founded. To keep faith with heretics has seldom, indeed, been deemed obligatory, when the higher interests of orthodoxy suggested its violation. Strange sacrifice of duty to dogma—of religion to theology! But so, alas! it is.

This purgation of the British and Foreign School Society from the plague of heresy was, however, a more complicated and difficult affair than either of the others. Law could not be invoked here in aid of orthodoxy. The less said about trust-deeds and foundations, the better. The origin of this Society did not date back to the long antiquity which hallows persecuting statutes. It simply disowned all the orthodoxies. The question was, how to introduce them quietly, insinuatingly and triumphantly. Majorities in the Parent Institution did not secure the approval of the supporters of schools connected with it throughout the country; and accordingly, when the system and management of the Parent Institution had been pretty thoroughly perverted from its foundation principles through the increasing proportion of unscrupulous orthodox men in the management, it was still a task of extremest delicacy to know how to represent that Society from place to place among the supporters of the connected schools throughout the country. There were districts where the supporters were chiefly orthodox, and, in ignorance or indifference respecting the question of faithful administration of trusts, were well pleased with the orthodox demonstrations of the Society's agents. But there were other places where the leading Dissenters and leading supporters of British schools were Unitarians, and where it was therefore necessary to represent the Society as knowing nothing of religious differences, but adhering to the principles of Joseph Lancaster, and using the Scriptures without note or comment. How was this to be managed? The accomplished Secretary, Mr. Dunn, was equal to either task. No need to send a zealous orthodox agent into one quarter, and an unsectarian one into another. Mr. Dunn was ambidextrous, *in utramque partem paratus*. At Bridport, Maidstone and Tenterden,

he could smile the Unitarians into the belief that the Society's principles were unchanged, and that they still recognized no distinctive theology objectionable to those persons. At Hull (where a Unitarian, who for thirty years had been the chief representative of the Borough-Road schools, was lately dead), he could stand up before an ungrateful assembly and be heard declaring that the Society's principles were unchanged indeed, for that they never had hesitated to teach the distinctive orthodox theology! At Bristol, this hypocrisy was detected and exposed by the Rev. George Armstrong. At Liverpool, in 1845, an agent of the Society—not Mr. Dunn, but a newer man at his work, and plainly not equally gifted for it—met an educational committee, of Unitarians chiefly, who were projecting a school; and being pressed with questions impugning the good faith of the Society, he wrote frequently to London to report the complaints made to him, and *he got no reply of any sort*. Mr. Dunn did not venture, either in writing or in person, to smooth things down in that instance.

One of the principal avowals of orthodoxy made by Mr. Dunn and the Committee on behalf of the Society, was provoked (it is curious to observe) by the taunts of a Churchman. The Rev. Francis Close, of Cheltenham, had charged them with jesuistry, in professing to use the Bible and exclude creeds and catechisms, whereas Mr. C. undertook to shew “that they were neither a scriptural Society nor a Society that excluded creeds and catechisms.” Mr. Dunn, in his published reply to Mr. Close (published with the unanimous sanction of the Committee), makes this declaration (p. 3):

“The British and Foreign School Society has never, in a single instance, compromised, in any school or schools under its control or reaping benefit from its funds, the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, or any other of those great fundamental truths on which our common Christianity is based.”

If this is true, or so far as it is true, the breach of trust is avowed and gloried in. And he says afterwards (p. 7):

“Nothing can be more unfair or absurd than to charge the British and Foreign School Society with Unitarianism, because Unitarians may occasionally think fit to establish, at their own cost, schools on the Lancasterian or British system.”

As if this was all that the Society ever had to do with Unitarians! A pure orthodox institution, no doubt, from the first, the mere machinery of which Unitarians had sometimes copied! They may be indebted to it for suggestions; but not it to them for principles, nor cash! What barefaced effrontery is this!

In 1843, Mr. Dunn published two letters in the *Patriot* newspaper in recommendation of the British and Foreign School Society to the especial support of the Congregationalists or



Independents. In the first of them he says plainly that Roman Catholics, Jews and Unitarians, cannot accept the principles which he is developing as those of the British and Foreign School Society.

"We need not wonder that some Unitarians should object to the character of the scriptural instruction which is imparted in schools by men who worship Christ and have faith in his atonement. But here the practical difficulty ends. Apart from the extreme cases just referred to, there is nothing to hinder a united religious education."

Cool indeed! "Apart from the extreme cases just referred to!" Of which cases, two were never comprehended in the fundamental religious arrangements of the British and Foreign School Society, but specially indulged when found;—the third was so comprehended. But they can be alike disregarded now, without care for trusts or pledges.

Yet, in his second letter, Mr. Dunn speaks of the British and Foreign School Society as "maintaining its original principle, *open to all, belonging exclusively to none.*" Which Mr. Dunn are we to believe? Is it one person, or two, that speak thus? A double tongue is it, or two tongues? Mr. Dunn is truly an able secretary!

In 1846, the Unitarian Association thought it high time to see if the gentlemen of the British and Foreign School Society could not be brought to book for their sins against good morals and generous education. The following resolution was passed at the annual meeting, J. B. Estlin, Esq., of Bristol, being in the chair:

"That it be referred to the Committee of the Association to consider whether any and what steps can be taken to secure that the schools of the British and Foreign School Society shall be conducted upon the original fundamental and comprehensive principles of the Society, without dogmatic teaching."

The Committee found this, as was to be expected, "a very difficult and delicate matter;" but, after due deliberation, resolved to draw up a case for counsel's opinion. The case so drawn was submitted to the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, with all politeness, for inspection, and was returned with a dogged refusal (perhaps wise) to give any opinion. It was then submitted to the Attorney-General (Jervis) and Mr. Rolt for their opinion. That opinion, with the previous proceedings, we must quote from the pamphlet before us.

"The following letter has been addressed to the British and Foreign School Committee, with the Draft of the foregoing part of this Case, and of the queries:

"*To the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society.*

"Gentlemen,—The Anti-Trinitarian Dissenters of England conceive that their civil rights are illegally infringed by the present management

of the British and Foreign School Society, and, as Solicitors for the Unitarian Association, we have been ordered to prepare a Draft Case, on which to obtain the first legal advice on the subject.

“The Association are very anxious not in any respect to misrepresent the facts, and also to state to Counsel, as far as possible, the grounds upon which the British and Foreign School Committee conceive themselves entitled to adopt the course they have pursued.

“With this view, we take the liberty to send the Draft Case to the British and Foreign School Society, and to request its perusal by the Committee, and to beg also that the Committee will make any statements which seem to it requisite to enable Counsel correctly to judge on the matter. Such statements shall be embodied in or accompany the Case.

“We are, Gentlemen, your very obedient servants,

“SHARPE, FIELD and JACKSON.

“41, Bedford Row, 22nd May, 1847.”

“To this letter the following reply was received:—

“British and Foreign School Society, June 21, 1847.

“Gentlemen,—I am instructed by the Committee to forward to you the following Minute, with the Draft of Case I received from you some days since.

“I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

“HENRY DUNN, Sec.

“Messrs. Sharpe, Field and Jackson.”

“(Extract.)

“A letter having been presented from Messrs. Sharpe, Field and Jackson, Solicitors to the Unitarian Association, accompanying a Draft of Case proposed to be laid before the Attorney-General and Mr. Rolt, the same was read, and the Secretary was instructed in reply to return the Draft of Case, respectfully informing Messrs. Sharpe, Field and Jackson that the Committee do not consider themselves called upon to give any opinion relative to the document in question.

“The Secretary was further instructed to state, that the Committee have no reason to believe that the original principles and rules of the Society have ever been departed from.”

“The opinion of Counsel is requested by the Unitarian Association—

“1. Whether the present administration of the Funds is not a breach of trust?

“2. And if so, in what way, and at whose instance, a more correct administration can be enforced?

“3. And further, if so, whether in point of law the present administrators of the Funds would be allowed by the Court to continue in office?

“OPINION.

“1. We think the exclusion of all doctrinal teaching, except so far as it necessarily results from the unaided reading of the Scriptures, is a fundamental principle of the Society. And assuming that doctrinal tests are now applied to the Teachers, or that doctrinal distinctions are now introduced and taught in the School, either by explanations of, or Commentaries on, the Scriptures, or otherwise, we are of opinion that the present administration of the Funds of the Society is a breach of trust.

“2. The remedy for any breach of trust will be by information of the



Attorney-General, in the Court of Chancery, at the relation of any parties who may feel themselves aggrieved by the present administration of the Society's Funds.

"3. There is nothing stated in the Case which, in our opinion, would absolutely disqualify the present administrators of the Funds from continuing in office, even if the Court should think they had been parties to the breach of trust complained of. If, however, their declared views on the subject of Education should appear to be incompatible with the due execution of the trusts to which the Funds of the Society are subject, the Court would remove them.

"JOHN JERVIS.

"Temple, 19th November, 1847."

"JOHN ROLT.

The opinion was also given *in extenso* as follows (Unitarian Association Report, 1848):

"1st. We understand it to be admitted on all hands, that one of the original rules of the Institution (the 4th) provided that no catechism or peculiar religious tenets should be taught in the School, and that this proviso has always been, and still is, maintained as one of the rules of the Institution. The leading and material facts contained in the pamphlet of Mr. Dunn which accompanied the Case, appear to be the following:—That the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ and of the Atonement have always been and still are taught in the School, and that no change whatever has at any time taken place in this respect. That in the earlier stages of the Society's history no objection was raised by the Unitarians to this course. That Mr. Fox, the first Secretary of the Institution, in a pamphlet published within two or three years after the foundation of the Society, represented in substance and effect (we do not give the precise words, for which see the pamphlet), that doctrines of the nature above referred to were treated by the Society as leading and uncontroverted doctrines, and were not 'peculiar religious tenets' within the meaning of the 4th rule. We have adverted also to the other statements in Mr. Dunn's pamphlet, and for the purpose of this opinion we assume every fact asserted therein to be capable of proof. We think that the construction of the proviso in the rules, that no peculiar religious tenets shall be taught in the Schools, if considered apart from extraneous evidence, is free from doubt. It forbids the teaching of any religious tenets peculiar to, or entertained exclusively by, any class of Christians. And we are of opinion that tenets entertained exclusively by Trinitarians are peculiar religious tenets within the language of this proviso. See the Answer of the Judges to the 6th Question of the House of Lords in Lady Hewley's Case.

"If it could be shewn by extrinsic evidence, that at the time the rules were drawn up, and amongst the several persons by whom they were resolved on, the words 'peculiar religious tenets' had acquired a limited or especial meaning differing from their primary and strictly legal interpretation, and so as to exclude Trinitarian opinions from their operation, the construction we have put upon the words might perhaps be controlled. We think, however, that the facts of the case afford no sufficient evidence of this nature, but rather lead to a contrary conclusion. It may be contended that the open and avowed practice, which according to the statements of the pamphlet has always prevailed, of

teaching in the Schools the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ and of the Atonement, must have induced many to subscribe to the Society in the belief that those doctrines would continue to be taught; and that having regard to the fact that Unitarians have to some extent (according to Mr. Dunn's statements) acquiesced in or not openly complained of the practice, the strict construction of the rules must now be controlled by the practice. But we think this view of the case is not sound, and that the language of the rules must prevail, notwithstanding the existence of a practice which in our opinion has been inconsistent with the intention of the founders of the Society, as clearly expressed in the rules. We are aware that Unitarians were not, at the time this Institution was founded, fully entitled to the benefit of the several Toleration Acts then in force, but we think this circumstance will not affect the view taken by Unitarians of their rights on the present question. Though the open preaching of their tenets might then have been illegal, it was not we think illegal to found an Institution in which the teaching of doctrines opposed to their tenets should be excluded. *On the whole, we are of opinion that the present administration of the British and Foreign School Society, as disclosed in Mr. Dunn's pamphlet, is a Breach of Trust.*

"2nd. We think the Fund bequeathed by Mr. Dawe cannot be properly applied to the Borough-Road School, or to any School where the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ and the Atonement are taught. It cannot in our opinion be said that the benefits of such a School are (within the meaning of Mr. Dawe's Will) open to the children of every religious persuasion."

This opinion was forwarded to the Chairman and Committee of the School Society; and the Unitarian Association Committee (1848) expressed themselves as follows in their yearly Report:

"What further steps should be taken is a subject for consideration; but we are not without hope that such an impression may be made on the minds of the many respectable and respected gentlemen, who, doubtless, with the most benevolent intentions, devote time and care to the affairs of the Society in question, that they will correct the evils of which there is reason to complain, bring the management of the Society into more perfect conformity with its originally impartial and liberal intent and constitution, and carry out strictly that grand Protestant principle which comprehends within it respect for individual conscience and for the highest authority in matters of revealed truth—the broad foundation of Christian brotherhood and the element of spiritual life, namely, 'the Scriptures without note and comment' (that is, as we understand it), without the enforcement of private interpretation, and without the erection and virtual imposition of peculiar and sectarian religious tests."

In 1849, the matter was again reported upon by the Unitarian Association Committee, to the effect that a conference had been proposed between a sub-committee of the School managers and a deputation from the Unitarian Association, for mutual explanation and "without prejudice," but had been declined by the School Society, who "did not recognize any deviation on their part from the fundamental principles of the Society." Subsequently, however, "the Committee of the School consented to



place the matter in dispute before two of their most respected subscribers."

At the Unitarian Association meeting in 1850, some impatience for the decision of the arbitrators was expressed in the following resolution:

"That this Association, earnestly desiring to promote the cause of unsectarian education for the poor, feels it a duty jealously to watch against any infringement of this great principle by those institutions which profess to be based upon it, and would refer to the consideration of the Committee the propriety of their taking such steps as may be desirable to obtain the decision of the Arbitrators appointed to determine the questions raised as to the alleged infringement, by the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, of the principles upon which that Society was founded."

And the wish was reiterated more strongly the following year:

"That this Meeting, having noticed the omission in the Committee's Report of any reference to that part of the Report of the last year stating the duty and necessity incumbent on this Association of taking efficient measures for the correction of abuses in the administration of the British and Foreign School Society, as affect the interests of the Unitarian body, pronounced by the late Attorney-General and Mr. Rolt to constitute 'a breach of trust,' desires to reiterate its wish that this subject may engage the immediate and earnest attention of the Committee of this year, with a view to a practical and satisfactory conclusion; and in particular to the prosecution of the Arbitration consigned, in part, to the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington, who has this day, for the second time, kindly expressed his readiness to carry out this part of the duty assigned to him."

Lord Monteagle afterwards expressed his willingness to go into the case with Dr. Lushington; and the Hon. Sec. of the Association wrote to Mr. Dunn, informing him of the readiness of these gentlemen to act as arbiters. In reply, Mr. Dunn stated that the managers did not admit that there was any ground of complaint, and did not hold themselves amenable to any other body; but were willing and anxious to satisfy such friends of the institution as Lord Monteagle and Dr. Lushington, that there had been no deviation from the Society's fundamental principles.

To make a long story short, these gentlemen, in February last, addressed the following joint memorandum to the Committee of the Unitarian Association:

"We have often expressed our opinion, and now repeat it, that the British and Foreign School Society was founded on the principle of religious equality, as regarded all professing the Christian faith; that in order to carry out this principle, the Scriptures were to be read in all the schools, carefully excluding all catechisms and all formularies of faith; that this principle was to be applied to all oral teaching, as well as to the books used.

"We consider, therefore, that the schools are open to those professing Unitarian opinions, as well as to any other Christians. In communicat-

ing with Mr. Dunn, these principles were distinctly acknowledged as the principles on which the Society was formed, and Mr. Dunn asserted that they had not been violated.

"The question, therefore, is one of fact, which we have not the means of satisfactorily investigating.

"MONTEAGLE.

"Feb. 27, 1854."

"STEPHEN LUSHINGTON.

And here the matter at present rests. No more satisfactory conclusion was to be expected from an arbitration not armed with authority, and accepted by the accused party under protest, merely in the hope of satisfying "such friends of the Society." We must, however, venture to observe, that the memorandum now quoted seems to recognize materials enough to justify some astonishment at its conclusion. Facts are admitted which abundantly prove that *oral teaching* (to which the principle of religious equality was to be applied as well as to the books) is relied upon by Mr. Dunn and his friends as the means of indoctrination. And we cannot but contrast the impotence of the conclusion with the strong and decided opinion of able counsel as to there having been a breach of trust.

A grave question remains,—whether Unitarians ought to take further legal steps for the enforcement of the trust. The Association has thus far hesitated to do so, in the hope that the power of opinion, and a recovered sense of what is right and just, would shame the managers of the School Society into a better adherence to their avowed principles. It seems to us, in reading these records, if we take merely Mr. Dunn's own self-contradictory assertions, impossible to doubt for one moment that the fundamental principle of religious equity, as understood and expressed between Unitarians and the other supporters of the British and Foreign School Society, has been grossly and systematically violated.

But it cannot be the wish of the Unitarian body to take this Society into their own hands, if the law would enable them. They have wider desires for its usefulness than they could themselves satisfy. They wish it to be the source of teachers for other denominations as well as for themselves. They would not, if they could, repeat the exclusion\* of which they complain. Nor

---

\* Mr. Dunn does not wish to *exclude* Unitarians. He says, "there is a wide difference between declining to co-operate with them and refusing to accommodate the teaching to their views." The latter "is a necessity arising out of the supreme homage due to convictions of truth and duty;" and lest it should be thought that Unitarians also owed homage to *their* views of truth and duty, the talented Secretary says,—"*The wrong supposed to be inflicted on Unitarians by teaching the doctrines they disavow, is after all imaginary; for they have scarcely any poor. Few in number and generally wealthy, they can easily provide schools for themselves*" (Letter to Mr. Heywood, p. 14). Again and again he virtually pleads guilty, and yields the whole case, by such admissions as these; but still he turns round again and insists that religious impartiality has been observed, because, forsooth! he believes it utterly impossible "*honestly* to teach the autho-



can they contemplate with pleasure the necessity of invoking the law to lay down its hard maxims of administration in reference to theological matters, even negatively. The counterpart to the spirit of the Hewley proceedings does not characterize them as a body.

Nor is it for us to advise the Unitarian Association what further steps to take. Only we trust that, if legal measures be prosecuted, they will be directed, not to taking the administration out of the hands of its present conductors (with the exception of their paid mouthpiece, to whose unscrupulous talent we ascribe the head and front of the offending), but to restraining all future injustice. If this can still be effected by any means out of Chancery, we shall rejoice to see such a result; but the total failure of the proposed arbitration renders it less likely than before.

There is a bright spot, meanwhile, appearing in the horizon of unsectarian education. Lord Brougham, at the close of the late session, laid on the table of the House of Lords a series of resolutions, able in themselves, and enforced by a speech which recalls the best days of Henry Brougham. We preserve that noble speech elsewhere in the present No. of the Christian Reformer. His Lordship's rebuke to this recreant School Society is full of the spirit of religious justice. Possibly opinion, thus expressed, may yet awaken its paltry theologians to the higher claims of good morals and public usefulness.

"It was," he said, "with the utmost astonishment and indignation that he had found so wide a departure from the principle on which the Society had been founded." "To such an extent," he added, "was this found, that he held in his hand the opinion of two learned friends of his, that of the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, when Attorney-General, and of Mr. Rolt, who, on a statement of the Society, signed by its own Secretary, being laid before them, gave their opinion that, in consequence of their dealing with the questions at issue between them and the Unitarians, they were administering their funds under a constant breach of trust, the funds being given on the condition of there being no such exclusion, no such test, no such dissidence between them and the other sects." "He hoped and trusted," he concluded, "that the notice he had taken of the grievous mistake into which very well-meaning men—over-zealous and without knowledge in their zeal—had fallen, would have the effect of leading them to remove this great abuse and grievance."

---

rized version of the Sacred Scriptures, in its plain grammatical sense, without inculcating the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement" (pp. 16, 17), which he coolly ranks among the "*leading and uncontroverted principles of Christianity.*" What can one do with such a man, but shew his duplicity to those who do possess moral perceptions? To reason *with him* is impossible. He has a conscience for his own orthodoxy, but none for ours, and he even wonders that we should have for our own! He would not *exclude* us therefore. He would admit—our contributions!

## THE LATE REV. THOMAS SMITH AND HIS PREDECESSORS.

THE lives which connect the present with former periods of our religious denomination are gradually dropping away. We record this month the death of the Rev. Thomas Smith, of Mixenden, near Halifax, formerly of Selby, in the 92nd year of his age. It took place on June 29th, preceded by only two days' illness. He was the son of the Rev. John Smith, who, on the death of his father (the Rev. Matthew Smith, A.M.) in 1736, succeeded to his ministry in Mixenden chapel, one of the chapels in the moorland district north of Halifax, founded by the Rev. M. Smith in 1717. In 1753, Mr. John Smith removed to Bradford, as successor to Rev. Joshua Hardcastle at the Old Presbyterian chapel, now called Chapel Lane. Here he continued the minister of a flourishing congregation till his death in 1768, his son Thomas being then five years old. Mrs. Smith\* survived her husband fifteen years. It was upon her death, the late Mr. Smith has been heard to say, that he left the Daventry Academy, where, from the account of the Daventry students in Vol. XVII. of the Monthly Repository, it appears that he stayed only three months. His contemporaries there were the Revds. John Holland, afterwards of Bolton, and William Allard, of Bury. Subsequently, after being some time with the Rev. Daniel Philipps, of Sowerby, father of the late Dr. Philipps, of Sheffield, he was two years at Glasgow. In 1791, he was for a short time assistant to the Rev. Newcome Cappe, of York; and in the same year settled with the congregation at Selby, where he continued to be minister till the year 1833. In that year he retired to the Mixenden parsonage, which his father had built; the chapel, however, having now for some time, like many others in the West Riding, passed out of Presbyterian into Independent hands. Having other property at Mixenden, in 1821, notwithstanding the alienation of the chapel, he liberally granted a site for a school in connection with it.

The Rev. John Dean, who succeeded Mr. John Smith at Bradford, married a daughter of his predecessor, sister of the late Mr. Thomas Smith; and a daughter of Mr. Dean becoming, in the next generation, the late Mrs. C. H. Dawson, connected the subject of the present notice with the Royds-Hall family.

Great interest will always attach to the name and labours of Matthew Smith, grandfather of the Mr. Smith whose death has

---

\* Her maiden name was Fox, of Rhodes Farm, near Stand, in Lancashire. She appears to have been somehow related to the Radclyffe family, of Todmorden Hall, to which it would seem the Rev. Radclyffe Scholefield (who was a native of Rochdale), formerly of the Old meeting-house, Birmingham, also belonged. The late Mr. Smith once mentioned a visit which Mr. Scholefield and his sister paid to his mother at Mixenden for a few days. One of Mrs. Smith's sons, born ten years before Thomas, was named Radclyffe Scholefield, but did not survive infancy. The late Mr. Smith used to speak of Mr. Scholefield's sister as his aunt.



just taken place. Independently of his being a noticeable man in his day, it is not a little striking that in the grandfather of one but just departed, we have a man who lived through the stirring times of the Commonwealth and Revolution.\* He was born, in 1650, at York, and appears to have enjoyed the advantage of early liberal education under Mr. Ralph Ward, the minister particularly patronized by Lady Hewley. He afterwards studied and graduated in the University of Edinburgh, and subsequently, it would appear in consequence of the persecuting statutes of Charles and James's days, left his native city, and settled in the wild moorland district north of Bradford and Halifax. "Persecution followed him hither," says a MS. of the late Rev. Thomas Smith. "Bands of soldiers were sent out in pursuit of him, but fortunately he never fell into the hands of his pursuers. His staff once became theirs; he had not time to take it." He was evidently a man of great strength, devoutness and integrity of character. Equally firm under persecution and proof against conformity with Oliver Heywood, he was more independent and liberal in his religious views, as appears alike from his own publications, the Diaries of Oliver Heywood himself, the Autobiography of Joseph Lister, the Life of Adam Martindale, and Thoresby's Diary and Correspondence. Like Oliver Heywood, he planted the seeds of some of the Presbyterian and Nonconformist churches in the West Riding, as the Kipping† at Thornton, a little north of Bradford; Warley, near Halifax; Eastwood, near Todmorden; and Mixenden. The *chapels* at Eastwood and Mixenden were actually founded by him.

Mr. Smith married Susannah Sharp, of the Little-Horton family of Sharps, adjoining Bradford, — a family which, in other branches, gave an archbishop to York, a coadjutor to Sir Isaac Newton, founders to the Leeds and Bradford Presbyterian chapels,‡ and

---

\* The great age of the last Mr. Smith, and the advanced period in the lives of the two first Mr. Smiths at which their sons were respectively born, explains the unusual phenomenon of their three lives extending over four years more than two centuries. Matthew, born 1650; John, 1705; Thomas, 1763, and living to 1854.

† The Kipping was originally an Independent foundation (Hunter's Oliver Heywood, p. 353). M. Smith served both this and Mixenden at the same time, and was ordained at Shuckden-head, at a private house, John Bury's, equally distant from his two churches, both also then meeting in private houses (Hunter's Oliver Heywood, p. 355). Curious light is thrown upon his character and position in the account given of him in the Autobiography of Joseph Lister. At the Kipping he came into a kind of rivalry with Accepted Lister, the son of Joseph, whose tomb and epitaph are still to be found in Thornton episcopal chapel-yard: "*Impendam et expendam.*"

‡ Rev. Thomas Sharp, M.A., resigned the vicarage of Addle on the Restoration, and afterwards gathered some of the beginnings of the present congregation at Bradford, by a service in his father's house at Little Horton, and was afterwards minister both of Morley (1675—1677) and Mill Hill, Leeds (1678—1693), yet still residing at Little Horton Hall. His daughter, married to Robert Stausfield, gave the ground for the present Bradford chapel, erected 1719, which, however, was preceded by one, still existing (converted into cottages), in Little

an emancipator to the slave.\* The initials of the lady whom Matthew Smith married are joined with his on the foundation-stone of the Mixenden chapel.

Towards the close of the century (the 17th) in the middle year of which he was born, he published two or three pieces which indicated the change in advance of his brethren that was going on in his mind. Among these were (in 1700), "The True Notion of Imputed Righteousness and our Justification thereby; being a Supply of what is lacking in the late Book of that most learned Person, Dr. Stillingfleet;" and, in the same year, "A Defence of the foregoing Doctrine against some growing Opposition among Neighbours, Ministers and Others." Prior to this, however, it appears from the Life of Adam Martindale, edited by Canon Parkinson, p. 230, section ix., he had (1683) published a book entitled, "The Patriarchal Sabbath," which excited the fears of Martindale, and, after some discussion with its author on occasion of his lecture at Bolton, Aug. 6th, probably the same year, provoked a reply from him, which from some cause or other was never published.† The same fears disquieted the minds of his Yorkshire brethren, as is evident from repeated notices in Oliver Heywood's Diaries, as extracted by Mr. Hunter, and perhaps also from the jealousy of the Listers of Kipping. Mr. Heywood sadly bemoans the endangered doctrine of Justification, that "*articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*." A MS. by Matthew Smith, entitled, "A Treatise concerning the Decrees of God," appears in Thoresby's Collection, No. 255.

He died in 1736, and was buried in the chapel at Mixenden, where a mural tablet to his memory stands at the end of the aisle on the left of the pulpit. The inscription, in Latin, by his son Isaac, who, singularly enough, had conformed and become vicar of Howorth, another high moorland still further north, is as follows. Whether age or scholarship determined the author we know not.

P. S. E.

REV. MATTHÆUS SMITH, M.A.

De Republica literaria optime meritis, in omni Re sacra Theologus peritissimus, concionator certe apostolicus.

Sinceram enim Christi doctrinam a sacro fonte depromptam, Regionibus quaquaversum sparsis, plane et perspicue predicavit.

Horton, now called Chapel House, in which there is the tradition that the philosopher preached. This was Abraham Sharp, alluded to above, here mistaken probably for his brother Thomas, who, though minister to Mill Hill, Leeds, yet, as resident at Horton, no doubt continued to nurture the church he had gathered in his own house. See Fawcett's Life of Oliver Heywood, p. 149, &c., and Oliver Heywood's Preface to Mr. Sharp's "Divine Comforts," &c. (Hunter's Life, p. 398).

\* Granville Sharp.

† We are reminded of the omission of all mention of Matthew Smith as a Hulton lecturer in Mr. Baker's "Rise and Progress of Nonconformity in Bolton." Martindale's lively description of his encounter with Smith, is an admirable illustration of the progress of opinion.



SSancta ejus Precepta strenue inculcavit, moribus ornavit.  
 Mixendensibus suis Cura Labore Constantia pastorali, per Annos plus  
 minus quinquaginta sedulo et feliciter invigilavit.  
 Gravis demum laudibus et senio confectus obiit.  
 Ebor. Natus Anno Dom. 1650.  
 Mixen. Denatus Die Aprilis 19, 1736.  
 Heu Pietas, heu prisca fides!

In 1737, his son John, now succeeding him, edited a volume containing five of his sermons, to which he prefixed a sketch of his life, and added three discourses of his own. The Life contains but few facts, and is chiefly a warm and full, though probably not an overcharged, eulogium on his character. It appears both himself and his son had offers of preferment in the Church, which both equally declined. The one was by a gentleman, of a benefice of £200 a-year; the other (as related by the late Mr. Smith) from Dr. Lee, vicar of Halifax, who wished Mr. John Smith, when at Mixenden, to take Illingworth, an adjoining chapelry, and to be lecturer at Halifax. Other offers of estate and property were made to M. Smith, which, out of honourable justice to the relatives of the offerers, he strictly also declined. The sermons, both father's and son's, are of a strong moral and spiritual tone,—“sharply pointed against vice, and bravely set to advance universal righteousness and holiness.” They do not (as the son remarks of the father in his Life) “sow [sew] pillows under armpits.” Hints might well be taken both from them and the life of the inner man depicted in the sketch. “He prevented the morning watch.” \* \* “All his delight was in the closet and pulpit. In the former, he maintained a holy intercourse between God and his own soul, was a hard student, and prepared himself with all his heart for the employment of the latter.” \* \* “He was an entire stranger to every recreation but that of conversing with good men.”\* Enough has been told of him to assure us how truly it is said, “He studied sincerely and impartially the *New Testament* of our blessed Lord, and would subscribe none of the petty Confessions of Faith which some of his Dissenting brethren love to impose. He abhorred, from the bottom of his heart, the practice of keeping up spiritual engines to screw and tyrannize over the consciences of others.” How striking an exemplification have we here of the doctrinal and the spiritual, of the devotional and the free-born, going together,—of the religious soul being the leader of the advancing mind!

That progress was going on. John Smith followed in his father's steps. He seems to have assisted him both at Warley and Mixenden some time before his death. He appears to have been a graduate of the Glasgow University. His name occurs

---

\* There is an excellent direction on this subject by the late Rev. John Ken-  
 tish, in his Charge at the ordination of Rev. F. Baker at Bolton, 1824-5.

in Mr. Jessop's\* diary, in the possession of Mr. H. J. Morehouse, of Stony Bank, as having occasionally supplied the Lydgate chapel on a vacancy. During his ministry at Bradford, he became one of the trustees of property left in 1756 to the Elland chapel and school (see Watson's History of Halifax, p. 573), a Brooksbank of which place married his sister. In the MS. of his son already quoted, he is said to have had a very large congregation at Bradford, the aisles even being crowded. In connection with exertions for the Chapels' Bill in 1844, the late Mr. Smith furnished evidence of the progress of sentiment in the Bradford congregation under his father's ministry. "Of my father's Unitarianism," he writes, "I believe I could furnish ample proof. At Bradford, when he was absent, Mr. Graham, an avowed Unitarian, often supplied his place. The members, at least the leading members of the congregation, excepting one or two, may be reckoned Unitarians about a century ago. It was perhaps owing to one of these, a Mr. Thomas Swain, that Mr. G. did not succeed my father 76 years ago."

"There was also one Jacob Hudson" (said the late Mr. Smith), "who, whenever Mr. Graham came to preach, used to leave the chapel. One day he came to my father in the vestry and said, 'I have been reading a very excellent sermon indeed, and I want to know the author, W. G., M.A.' 'Oh!' said my father, 'it's Mr. Graham whom you would not hear.' He was a singular character," added the relater of the anecdote. "Some one gave him offence, and he declared he would never sit down with him in that chapel any more: he came regularly, but he took care never to sit down." His description on his tomb as "*yeoman*," savours somewhat of such antecedents.

On looking over the volume of his father's and grandfather's sermons not long ago, Mr. Smith observed on the doxology at the end of the second by his father, viz., "Which God grant through the merits and mediation of his only Son, our blessed Lord. To whom, with the Father, &c.,"—"Yes, but afterwards it used to be, '*Laus Deo soli*.'"

The Rev. A. Dean has remarked that John Smith concludes each of his sermons with the Trinitarian doxology, while Matthew uniformly omits it. From the above, it appears to have been different afterwards: "The printed sermons are of a date prior to 1737. He may, however, have been less decided than Matthew; as is not unusual, one quality in the father may have produced something of its opposite in the son." Mr. Dean likewise relates that John made a practice at Bradford to the last of attending prayers at church when they were read on week-days, though he would not turn to the east at the Apostles'

---

\* The medical man, active observer, and steady frequenter of the chapel, in that striking and romantic neighbourhood. The same might be said of the gentleman who inherits his papers.



Creed: and that this was the occasion of a joke; for when one friend told another of the omission, he said, "Oh, I'll *roast* him for it!" "But how can you," replied the former, "if he won't *turn*?"

The Mr. Graham mentioned above, was the Rev. William Graham, M.A., of Warley, the friend of Dr. Priestley, and noticed in his Memoirs. He was the author of "Repentance the only Condition of Final Acceptance, a Sermon delivered before the Dissenting Clergy at Mill-Hill Chapel, in Leeds, Sept. 18, 1771;" and of "The Doctrine of Atonement briefly Considered, in Letters to a Young Gentleman at the University; with Dr. Duchal's Letter to Dr. Taylor, 1772." Mr. Graham was not a common man. It was he whom Dr. Lee, vicar of Halifax, desired to introduce Dr. Priestley to him. He wrote a Latin epitaph for Dr. Lee, as well as others for some of his Dissenting brethren, as we shall see. It was always a subject of regret with the late Mr. Smith, that his biography was not included in his friend Mr. Turner's *Lives of Eminent Unitarians*. Dr. Priestley says of him (*Memoirs*, Rutt, I. 11): "The most heretical ministers in the neighbourhood were Mr. Graham, of Halifax, and Mr. Walker, of Leeds; but they were frequently my aunt's guests [about 1750]. With the former of these, my intimacy grew with my years, but chiefly after I became a preacher. We kept up a correspondence to the last, thinking alike on most subjects. To him I dedicated my '*Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit*;' and when he died [1782], he left me his MSS., his Polyglot Bible, and two hundred pounds. Besides being a rational Christian, he was an excellent classical scholar, and wrote Latin with great facility and elegance. He frequently wrote to me in that language." Mr. Rutt adds several notes. In connection with our present subject, it is evident both from Mr. Graham succeeding the Smiths at Warley,\* and from a man of similar advancement, viz. Dr. Richie, succeeding them at Mixenden, that the good seed was growing which they had gone forth in tears to sow.

According to the information of the late Mr. Smith, Dr. Richie, a physician, had had some pastoral charge in the north, which from some disagreement he left, and settled at Mixenden when Mr. John Smith removed to Bradford in 1753. "He was the author," says Mr. Smith's MS., "of a learned work on Sacrifices, which was revised by that excellent defender of both Unitarianism and Christianity, Dr. Lardner." He appears to have written more than one treatise. He continued at Mixenden till his death in 1763. Watson's *History of Halifax*, p. 501,

---

\* There had been at Warley, contemporary with the Smiths, the Rev. Isaac Wilkinson, great-grandfather of the Rev. R. Astley, of Shrewsbury. He died March 2, 1721-2, aged 36, and is described, on his tombstone in the chapel-yard at Bradford, as "a pious and painful minister of the gospel."

has an account of his publications. He appears to have practised physic in connection with his ministry at Mixenden. The following is Mr. Graham's estimate of him, as recorded on the tablet to his memory against the chapel front to the left of the right-hand door:

M. S.

JACOBÍ RICHIE, V.D.M. et M.D.

Qui Octobris die 15to 1763, Annum ætatis agens sexagesimum quintum fatis concessit MIXENDENO ubi rei sacræ annos plus minus decem operam sedulo navaverat. Vir probus perspicax, partiumque studio immunis veritati unice litavit. Ingenii monumenta vitæque non otiose peractæ orbi literato præclara reliquit, unum dum in vivis typis mandavit alterum opus vere aureum multoque ejus sudore ac labore conscriptum posteris tradendum moribundus curavit.

On a nearly adjoining tablet, his similar testimony to his friend Mr. John Smith, who died five years after Dr. Richie, is as follows:

Here are deposited the remains of the Rev. Mr. JOHN SMITH, formerly Dissenting Minister at Mixenden, late at BRADFORD, whose unremitting attention in both places to the dutys of a public Station and Character, as well as the dignity and almost unexampled Humanity wherewith he filled the several departments of Husband, Parent, Neighbour, Friend, in private Life, made him equally the object of regard with all partys, equally lamented by all at his death, April 7th, 1768, Aged 63.

These and other monuments of plain, smooth stone, had formerly a place inside the chapel, but probably at the rebuilding in 1810, or enlarging in 1836, were removed to their present situation. There is a similar one with a Latin inscription, also by Mr. Graham, to the memory of the Rev. Thomas Evans, for fifteen years (*tria lustra*) Dr. Richie's successor. The chapel-book preserves the succession of ministers to the present day. Among those who immediately succeeded to Mr. Evans, occurs the name of Daniel Jones (1783—1791), an Unitarian. At what point the line was diverted to the Independents does not appear. The late Mr. Smith's remark one day upon some of the names was, that the congregation began to be weary of Welsh Presbyterianism. It cannot, however, but be a subject of serious regret, that venerable old chapels, monuments of the advanced zeal and piety of our ancestors, and abounding thus with records that endear their learning, and, one would have thought, should have secured their deposit to us, have nevertheless passed out of our legitimate inheritance, and failed to mature the promise of their enlightened founders and first ministers. Here (in a small circuit of the West Riding, and just where our work has now to be begun afresh) are Northouram, Eastwood, Warley, Mixenden, Keighley, Bingley, Idle, Pudsey, Morley, all in this case. At Northouram (Oliver Heywood's), Warley, Idle, new and hand-

some chapels have been recently built by the Independents. Of the Bingley one it is difficult to find a trace; probably the Independent chapel is its successor, as is the case at Pudsey (the scene of Rev. W. Turner's ordination in 1782), although the old chapel remains, converted into cottages. Morley is almost a solitary instance (Kirkstead, in Lincolnshire, is said to be another) of a chapel originally belonging to the Church of England, becoming a Dissenting place of worship. It had become disused in the time of Charles I., and was leased by the Saviles, Earls of Sussex, in 1650, to Presbyterian trustees for five hundred years. Nor was it restored with Charles II. Not half the term is expired, and we have lost it.\* The curious old structure remains, stretching low over its elevated site, rich in Nonconformist and other memorials,—Lady Loughborough's† mausoleum and the tomb of Waller's daughter,—and contrasting strangely with the substantial modern school-room which the Independents have built in connection with it. All these were the resorts of our Presbyterian forefathers, and most of them, nearly a century ago, received the visits of Dr. Priestley, Mr. Turner of Wakefield, and their contemporaries, at their periodical meetings of ministers.‡ At the first of those meetings, in 1691, Presbyterians and Independents attempted to agree,§ but Matthew Smith was there, and it would not do. He wished to declare the whole counsel of God, and that was private judgment. Consequently, the Presbyterians have met alone, and their untenacious principle has sometimes lost them a chapel. That at Mixenden, however, was not closed against the grandson of its founder, its kind and forbearing benefactor. He was interred, like his ancestors and their kindred, within it. It had been his wish that his interment should have taken place at the Halifax public cemetery, and that his friend Mr. Turner should have officiated. But his remains already rested there; and in the absence of Mr. Ryland, of Bradford, as well as of Mr. Barling (Mr. Turner's successor), at the time, Mr. Higginson performed the service at Mixenden on the 5th of July.

Dr. Bateman, who had known Mr. Smith from early life, and who shewed him kind attentions to the last, writes,—

“He had a great interest in religion and religious matters to the close of his life. He had established preaching in his own house, which was continued up to the time of his death, the

---

\* Hunter's *Life of Oliver Heywood*, pp. 164 and 272. Allen's *Yorkshire*, III. 289, 290. Scatcherd's *History of Morley*.

† One of the Morley Dawsons, married to Wedderburn, Solicitor-General, afterwards Lord Loughborough. She was his first wife, and died in 1781, aged 36.

‡ There are memoranda in MS. of this being the case between the years 1764 and 1773. It is much to be regretted that the official minute-book of the meetings is missing.

§ Hunter's *Life of Oliver Heywood*, pp. 373—376.



ministers being those in connection with the Christian Brethren. He was too deaf to hear the services, but he always imposed upon the ministers the condition that they were 'not to deny the miracles.' He was a thorough-going follower of Dr. Priestley."

Mr. Ryland, on his return, adverted to Mr. Smith's death, on Sunday, July 30th, in the following terms:

"There are a few whose lives on earth God lengthens out to an unusual span, as if to prevent our too soon forgetting the wisdom of the past in the hopes and light and ardours of the present, in connection often with particular movements or opinions that have a definite and marked influence in the world. One such life has been terminated during my recent absence from among you,—a life connected with ourselves, with our families, with our religious society, and, what is most remarkable, the last of three lives extending in lineal succession over a period of more than two centuries; thus taking us back to the greatest crisis in our national history, and, as is usual in Divine Providence, to a great crisis also in our religious history, and, as is not unusual again, to a crisis illustrating the connection of freedom with religion, and consequently, we are proud to say, most intimately connected with our own distinctive views.

"The father of the late Mr. Smith, of Mixenden, formerly of Selby, was for some years minister of this place about the middle of the last century, and, with others, exhibited a change from the old orthodox or Trinitarian to the Unitarian view of Christianity. His father, the Rev. Matthew Smith, was the first minister in this neighbourhood who gave indications of the first departure. Our friend now taken, was firmly attached to the advancing views, and, as illustrated by Dr. Priestley, Lindsey and others at the close of the century, he held to them with a zeal and attachment, jealous alike for their truth, and the honour, courage and devotion of the men who, amid obloquy and loss and almost a martyr's fate, asserted and maintained them. Honour be to them and to him! We need a concentrated self-devotion to *conviction* and to definite lines of duty. For all lines are now too much mingling in one undistinguishable path. May we bear all such in grateful and affectionate remembrance, and transmit their virtues to a late posterity. Be ye 'imitators of those who through faith and patience are inheriting the promises.'"

#### OPINIONS.

Look at any long avenue of trees, by which the traveller on our principal highways is protected from the sun. Those at the beginning are wide apart; but those at the end almost meet. Thus happens it frequently in opinions.—*Walter Savage Landor.*

## MR. HUNTER'S NEW WORK ON THE FOUNDERS OF NEW PLYMOUTH, THE PARENT COLONY OF NEW ENGLAND.\*

THE goodly volume of which we give below the title, is, in fact, a new edition of the Critical and Historical Tract, which Mr. Hunter published in 1849, respecting the First Colonists of New England. That tract has excited in both England and America much interest and curiosity; and it has been generally acknowledged that Mr. Hunter has, by his very remarkable discoveries respecting the English portion of the history of the PILGRIM FATHERS,† changed the face of the whole history of the movement during the residence of the actors in it in England. In the interval that has elapsed since its publication, Mr. Hunter has made some new and interesting discoveries, which, in the work before us, he has incorporated with the facts previously narrated. He has approached his task, he tells us, in the spirit of an antiquary, "in contradistinction to the controversial, the sectarian, or other party spirit." On some matters of opinion, we suspect that there is a considerable divergence between our author and ourselves; but we recognize and thank him for the spirit of truthfulness which makes him fairly narrate every fact which he has grasped, whether it accord or otherwise with his own wishes and predilections.

---

\* Collections concerning the Church or Congregation of Protestant Separatists formed at Scrooby in North Nottinghamshire, in the Time of King James I.: the Founders of New Plymouth, the Parent Colony of New England. By the Rev. Joseph Hunter. 8vo. Pp. 205. London—J. Russell Smith. 1854.

† We use the words, notwithstanding Mr. Hunter's censure of them in the following note:

"There is something of affectation in this term, which is always displeasing; and we have seen also very strange applications of it: but further, it appears to me to be philologically improper. A pilgrim is a person who goes in a devout spirit to visit a shrine—real in the first instance but afterwards a place where, it may be, no shrine is, but which is hallowed by some recollections which would deserve to have a substantial representative. An American who visits the place from which the founders of his country emigrated is a pilgrim in the proper sense of the word, whether he find an altar, a shrine, or a stone of memorial, or not. But these founders when they sought the shores of America were proceeding to no object of this kind, and even leaving it to the winds and the waves to drive them to any point on an unknown and unmarked shore. There is, however, it must be owned, the same corrupt use of the word Pilgrim in the English version of the Scriptures, 'and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.'"—P. 5.

Mr. Hunter is surely wrong in saying that the phrase is *philologically* improper. The etymology of the word pilgrim is immediately from the Dutch *pelgrim*; but both words have a common origin in the Latin *peregrinus*, = *qui peregrè venit*, one from another land, a wanderer. The quotation from Hebrews xi. 13, ought to have protected the word pilgrim, in its application to the founders of New Plymouth, from the charge of affectation. Even if the word were limited as Mr. Hunter would have it, we think its application in this case might be sufficiently reconciled to reality. The emigrants of 1620 went to pay their homage to pure religion and spiritual liberty. They found in New England the shrine which at home was destroyed. The term, whatever be its character, is inwrought into our literature, and is now an absolute necessity. Believing this, we are glad not to sympathize with Mr. Hunter's objection.



The tracking of the Pilgrim Fathers to their English home at Scrooby, by Mr. Hunter in his former tract, was a very interesting circumstance, and has naturally directed antiquarian research to that district. Mr. Hunter thus describes the religious characteristics of Basset-Lawe, the hundred in which Scrooby lies:

"The vicinity of Scrooby was in those times, and is now, an agricultural district; having a few villages scattered about, each with its church and perhaps an esquire's seat; but the population was for the most part employed in husbandry, an occupation little congenial to the growth of extreme opinions in either religion or politics, or of voluntary sacrifices to a severe estimate of duty or a supposed call of conscience. The very natural features of the country may be said to have been unpropitious to the production of persons such as those who formed the emigration; for it is usually in hilly countries not in plains that the sense of religious duty takes deepest root and produces the most remarkable fruits, or where men are collected in large masses, as in cities or great commercial towns. There had indeed been an unusual number of religious houses surrounding Scrooby in the times before the Reformation. Almost all the more conspicuous of the religious orders had here a representative; for there were Cistercians at Rufford, Gilbertines at Mattersey, Carthusians in the Isle of Axholm, Benedictines at Blythe, Benedictine ladies at Wallingwells, Augustinians at Worksop, and Premonstratensians at Welbeck, the chief house of that Order. These formed quite a cordon round the part of Basset-Lawe Hundred to which Scrooby belongs, while a little farther removed was the house of Cistercians in a woody and stony valley eminently adapted to monastic habits, called the House of St. Mary of the Rock, but better known by its modern name of Roche Abbey. It might be expected that the existence of so many conspicuous seats of devotion would give an air of seriousness and piety to the places within their influence, which might remain even when their reverend heads were brought to the dust; and it is probably at least to influences thus created that we find several of the principal families of Basset-Lawe, the Molineuxes and Markhams, the Cliftons and Mortons, adhering to the *old Christianity*, (?) and suffering hardships in consequence. There were also in those times two very distinguished ladies who retained a fondness for the old profession, Mary (Cavendish) Countess of Shrewsbury, at Rufford, and her sister Frances Lady Pierrepont, at Thoresby. That it had much to do in originating the strong puritan feeling which pervaded the middle and lower classes of the population of Basset-Lawe can hardly be affirmed; but the presence of so much Catholic zeal would be likely to sharpen the opposition of those who had persuaded themselves that the Protestant could not go too far in his renunciation of everything that appeared to belong to Rome, or that revived or kept up the recollection of what England had been in the days of their grandfathers."—Pp. 24—26.

We have italicised our author's expression, "*old Christianity*," when speaking of the Romish form of religion. The *old Christianity* is surely Christianity as it came from its Founder and his personal disciples and apostles. It is older by centuries than that corrupt form of religion of which the Bishop of Rome is the acknowledged head. Nor do we think it unreasonable to suppose

that the strong Puritan feeling which sprang up in the vicinity of Scrooby, was a natural and necessary reaction against the corruptions which probably grew rankly under the shade of that cordon of religious houses in Basset-Lawe, of which Mr. Hunter speaks. We know that in other parts of England the seeds of reformation sprung up most strongly where the people had visible proofs of the fruits of the Popish faith. Nowhere in England did Protestantism find more earnest advocates than in Lancashire, where Popery existed in great strength.

Mr. Hunter goes on to observe (p. 28), and we doubt not with some truth, that the Puritanism of Scrooby was probably owing to the accidental circumstance of the residence in Basset-Lawe, and the parts immediately contiguous, of several clergymen, whose private studies had led them to adopt strong Puritan opinions, and who by their zeal and eloquence acquired great influence over the many around them. Admitting this, we may, without impropriety, regard their strong opinions (Mr. Hunter styles them "extreme views") as the consequence of their accidental position in the midst of the religious houses of the Cistercians, Gilbertines, Carthusians, Benedictines, Augustinians and Premonstratensians. It may confirm this view if we look into the work of a Lancashire divine of the times of the Scrooby Separatists, John White, of Eccles, who, in his "Way to the True Church" (the Preface to which is dated October 29th, 1608), writes most deplorably of the "prodigious ignorance" and superstition of the common people of Lancashire. "What man," said he, "is he who trembles not to see simple people so far seduced that they know not how to pronounce or say their daily prayers; or so to pray that all who hear them shall be filled with laughter? And while superstitiously they refuse to pray in their own language with understanding, they speak that which their leaders may blush to hear."

We have read with considerable interest Mr. Hunter's enlarged biographical notices of the clergy of Basset-Lawe, under whose ministrations the Puritan Fathers imbibed their dauntless love of reformation. The first named is John Smith, more commonly spelt Smyth, who was on many accounts a remarkable man. He was, in fact, the founder of the sect of the English General Baptists. Mr. Hunter has in part adopted the account of him given in Brooks' *Lives of the Puritans*. There is a more careful account in Taylor's *History of the General Baptists*, I. 65—86. Taylor questions the propriety of identifying the John Smyth, pastor of Gainsborough, with the John Smith who was persecuted for Non-conformity in 1592; for he says, "This John Smith was the oldest of thirty-one persons who were apprehended on the same charge in 1567, and it is hardly probable that forty years afterwards he should have taken so active a part in the emigration to Holland." Smyth's separation from his religious friends, and



adoption of heresy after heresy, exposed him to severe censure. His own works are exceedingly scarce; and Crosby, when writing his History of the English Baptists, said he "could find no account of him but from his enemies." Mr. Hunter has given us some extracts of his controversial works, which are harsh and indefensible. At the same time, it must be remembered that the morals of controversy were in the beginning of the 17th century little understood, and that coarseness and contumely appear in the writings of many men throughout that century, whom yet we honour as ornaments of literature and as sincere Christians.

Many of Smyth's opinions were before his age. Some which entitle him to our admiration, drew down on him the anger of his contemporaries. He held the doctrine of free-will and universal redemption, and opposed the predestination of particular persons to eternal life. He denied the claim of any *translation* of scripture to be the word of God, and he renounced the doctrine of original sin. He appears also to have discarded from his idea of the Lord's-day sabbatic associations. He was habitually devoted to free inquiry, and asked his countrymen to judge of his opinions only by his last writings. Neal, strangely enough, alleges this fact as a proof his having "an unsettled head." With what skill and learning Mr. Smyth could conduct a scriptural argument, appears from Mr. Taylor's estimate of his defence of adult baptism against Mr. Clifton in that extremely rare Baptist tract entitled, "The Character of the Beast, or the False Constitution of the Church Discovered." "This work," he says, "is managed in the syllogistical method; and as Mr. S. repeats the arguments of his opponent previously to his replying to each, it contains the reasonings of both parties. Though this was probably the first publication on the subject among Englishmen after the Reformation, there have been few arguments brought forward, by the numberless writers who have since engaged in the controversy, which are not noticed in this pamphlet. It is written with considerable ability, and the dispute is conducted with great address." Mr. Underhill, the able editor of several of the Hanserd Knollys' publications, speaks in terms of high respect of Mr. Smyth, and alleges that his adoption of Baptist sentiments exposed him to great and unmerited reproach, and to charges of maintaining opinions the reverse, in some cases, of those he held. The common artifices of controversy were freely used against him, and the conclusions of his opponents attributed to him as his own. His contemporaries acknowledged his talents and worth, even when they denounced his opinions. "With great sorrow," said Mr. Clifton, "I am forced to undertake this business against him that was dear to me,—against him to whose charge both I and divers others had once purposed to have committed our souls." Bishop Hall called him Mr. Robinson's leader, guide, general and oracle.

Baillie, no complimentary critic, styled him "a man of right eminent parts," and Governor Bradford prefaces his censures of his opinions by the admission that he was an eminent man in his time and a good preacher, and of other good parts. With these facts before us, we may concede to Mr. Hunter, that Smyth was very harsh and displeasing in controversy, and yet dwell (which our author intimates that he cannot) on his character with "calm and discriminating approbation."

The next Puritan minister whom Mr. Hunter names as connected with the district of Basset-Lawe, was Richard Bernard; and here we are happy to find ourselves more in accord with our author.

"Bernard was a man of gentle and yet determined spirit; and so decided were his objections to the ceremonies, that he was silenced by the archbishop at Worksop, where he was the vicar. But he never went into the way of separation, though his preaching must have contributed to lead others to do so. Bradford's notice of him is very slight. He speaks of him only as one who had been 'hotly persecuted by the prelates.' I shall add a few dates and particulars, as of a man who has received less notice than he deserves at the hands of the dispensers of posthumous honours. He was born in 1566 or 1567, according to the inscription on his engraved portrait, which states that he was 74 at the time of his death, 1641. While very young he fell under the notice of two ladies, daughters of Sir Christopher Wray, lord chief justice of England, who were among the most eminent of those times for piety and Christian zeal. One of them was the wife successively of Godfrey Foljambe, Esquire; Sir William Bowes, of Walton, near Chesterfield; and of John, the good Lord Darcy of Aston. The other married Sir George Saint Paul, of Lincolnshire; and afterwards, the Earl of Warwick. They sent him to Christ's College, Cambridge, where it seems that he might be contemporary with Smith. They were probably in other respects his benefactors, since in the dedication of his first printed work he speaks of them as those to whom next to God and nature he owed all that he had.

"The work to which this dedication is prefixed is not such a work as we should expect to find as the first-fruits of a young Puritan minister's studies, for it is a translation of the plays of Terence, a small quarto, printed by John Legate, at Cambridge, in 1598. We collect from it that Bernard was then residing at Epworth, in the Isle of Axholm, a place not far distant from Scrooby, from whence issued a family which originated a more formidable separation from the Church than that in which Bernard was an agent. Not long after the publication of this volume he was removed from Epworth, having been presented by Richard Whalley to the vicarage of Worksop, where he received institution on the 19th of June, 1601.

"Here he was for several years the very zealous minister, carrying to an extreme length the Puritan scruples, going to the very verge of separation; and joining himself even to those of his Puritan brethren, who thought themselves qualified to go through the work of exorcism. At length when Smith, and doubtless other persons, when they saw him silenced by the archbishop, were expecting that he would break

from all church authority, he began to consider more fully the question of conformity; and when this consideration issued in an approval of a National Church, if one could be constituted in a manner conformable to the intimations on that subject to be found in scripture, as preferable to an entire withdrawal from communion with it, he was restored to the exercise of his ministry, determined thenceforth to be more forbearing in his demands and more submissive to authority; and for this it is that Smith heaps upon him terms of the grossest abuse, Apostate, Deceiver, Worldly Man." \* \* \*

"While at Worksop, Bernard printed several controversial writings and his *Faithful Shepherd*, a treatise on the duties of ministers, quarto, 1607. This is dedicated to Dr. Montagu, Dean of the Chapel Royal, an offering of thankfulness for many past favours.

"He witnessed the formation of the Scrooby Church and its departure to Holland, during the time of his residence at Worksop. He ceded the living in 1612 or 1613, on his appointment to another in a distant county, the rectory of Batcombe, in Somersetshire. It was bestowed upon him by a private patron as to a minister who, in his opinion, would best discharge the duties to the edification of the parishioners—an act both just and honourable. Here he continued till his death, publishing from time to time works in practical divinity, which had a large share of popularity, and which are sometimes reprinted even in our time. And with this I dismiss this eminent divine, best known not as Bernard of Worksop, but as Bernard of Batcombe." Pp. 35—40.

To Mr. Hunter's pleasing sketch, we desire to add a few particulars respecting this amiable, "conformable Puritan," who was permitted, it is said, to retain his place in the Church without strict conformity to the ceremonies which he disapproved. The Bishop of Winchester had been his familiar associate at the University, and it is thought helped to screen him from the consequences of his Nonconformity. To Bernard is assigned, by Dr. Adam Clarke, the merit of having suggested—by the publication of his allegory, entitled, "The Isle of Man, or the Legal Proceeding in Manshire against Sinne"—to the mind of Bunyan the idea of his immortal Pilgrim. Southey thinks that Bunyan had seen Bernard's book. A short passage or two from this book may perhaps be thought to have some bearing on the author's controversy with Smyth on the one hand, and his Popish accusers on the other. He is describing the informers who endeavour to mislead the prosecutor of sin:

"The seventh is *Scruplesity*; this is an unsociable and snappish fellow; he maketh sins to himself, more than the Law condemneth, and liveth upon fault-finding; *Weaker Apprehension* is his *Father*, and *Misunderstanding* his *Mother*, and an *Uncharitable* heart his *Nurse*. The use of Christian liberty, if it be more in his conceit than he pleaseth to like well of, then would he have the *Hue and Cry* sent against it, as against *carnal security*: this is a rigid and censorious Adversary.

"The eighth is the *Babbling Babylonian*; this is a doting companion, and superstitiously foolish; he boasteth of *Antiquity*, though his ways



be Novelty; yet he will have it the *Old Religion*, and if any forsake it as idolatry, those he condemneth as schismaticks, and labours to have the *Hue and Cry* sent out against all Reformation in Christian Churches, as against Heresie. This is a bloody *Anti-christian* Adversary."

Richard Bernard had a kind and compassionate heart. He was one of the first to write on the subject of prison discipline, and the necessity of the religious instruction of prisoners. He denounced the prison of his day as "a very picture of Hell, and no less than a preparative thereto." He urged that, by the attendance of faithful ministers and the provision of bodily employment to the helpless inmates, the prison should be made a "House of Correction with instruction." All this will be found beautifully stated in the Epistle prefixed to the work from which we have already quoted. It may also be mentioned to the honour of Richard Bernard, that he put himself forward to stop prosecutions for the crime of witchcraft. He was moved to this by the melancholy and shocking fate of five brothers and sisters condemned and executed for witchcraft. A sixth member of the family was in danger from a similar charge, when Bernard prepared a book of Cautions and Directions, in twenty-eight chapters, entitled, "A Guide to Grand Jurymen in Cases of Witchcraft." He was in some little danger from his upright and bold "apology against vain accusers," but found a protector in one of the wiser occupants of the bench, Judge Denham. To appreciate the benevolent wisdom of Bernard, it must be remembered that not less than 10,000 persons suffered for this imaginary crime in the 30 years that followed his protest; that nearly 40 years after, Sir Matthew Hale was a party to the death, by burning, of two reputed witches; and that the laws against witchcraft were not repealed until 109 years after. Surely it is our duty not to let such a man as Richard Bernard be forgotten!

The next minister named by Mr. Hunter is Richard Clifton, whom in his first edition he had positively assigned to the vicarage of Marnham, near Newark, and the rectory of Babworth, near Retford, and had conjectured the possibility of this Richard being a member of the Clifton family in Nottinghamshire, in whom a baronetcy is vested. Through a clue given in that useful publication, the *Notes and Queries*, Mr. Hunter has now become acquainted with some important dates in the history of Richard Clifton, recorded in an old family Bible preserved in the library of Sir Robert Taylor's institution at Oxford. Richard Clifton, it is thus ascertained, was the son of Thomas Clifton, of Normanton, in the county of Derby; that he was born in or about 1553, being the eldest of a large family; that he married in September, 1586, into the family of Stuffyn, of Sherbrook, in the parish of Pleasley, in Derbyshire, this event taking place just when he had obtained the rectory of Babworth; that he had issue

three sons and three daughters; *that in August, 1608, he removed to Amsterdam*; that his wife died there in 1613, aged 58; and that he followed her, and was buried in the same resting-place, 1616, aged 63. The document, now referred to for the first time, absolutely fixes the date of the removal to Amsterdam, 1608.

Another minister probably connected for a time with the district was Thomas Toller, who was decidedly Puritan in his tastes, although he lived and died in the communion of the Church of England, and for nearly fifty years filled the important cure of Sheffield. Mr. Hunter mentions a curious MS. document prepared by him about 1612, respecting the leaning of the clergy in the deanery of Doncaster, from which it appears that out of about seventy ministers, eighteen were more or less disaffected to the ceremonies.

Another minister named by Bradford, concerning whom Mr. Hunter gathers up some particulars, was Robert Gifford, beneficed at Laughton-en-le-Morthen, in Yorkshire, but adjoining Workop. He was "hotly persecuted by the prelates," but did not become a Nonconformist, though classed with those who "seemed weary of the ceremonies."

The last minister named by Mr. Hunter is Hugh Bromhead, who was a thorough Separatist, and was one of the early emigrants to Holland. He worshiped in the church of John Smyth. From a curious letter from him and his wife to a relative in London, given by Mr. Hunter in the Appendix, we extract an account of the mode of conducting public service in the church at Amsterdam:

"The order of the worship and government of our Church is, 1. We begin with a prayer; after, read some one or two chapters of the Bible, give the sense thereof, and confer upon the same: that done, we lay aside our books, and after a solemn prayer made by the first speaker, he propoundeth some text out of the Scripture, and prophesieth out of the same by the space of one hour or three quarters of an hour. After him standeth up a second speaker, and prophesieth out of the said text, the like time and place, sometimes more, sometimes less. After him the third, the fourth, the fifth, &c., as the time will give leave. Then the first speaker concludeth with prayer as he began with prayer, with an exhortation to contribution to the poor, which collection being made, is also concluded with prayer. This morning exercise begins at eight of the clock and continueth unto twelve of the clock. The like course and exercise is observed in the afternoon from two of the clock unto five or six of the clock. Last of all, the execution of the government of the Church is handled."—P. 172.

What ultimately became of Bromhead is not known. It must be borne in mind that the church at Scrooby was the cradle of the founders of New Plymouth. The Gainsborough church had a material influence in promoting the separation from the Church of England, and Smyth and a portion of his flock led the example

of emigration to Holland; but the Amsterdam church finally came to nothing, while the Leyden church continued to flourish, and kept together and trained in an exalted spiritual discipline the men who were to carry civilization and religion and spiritual freedom to the wilderness of America.

Scrooby Hall, a manor alienated from the see of York, was the residence of elder William Brewster, who, as the simple narrative of his friend Governor Bradford relates, "bore his part in weal and woe with the persecuted church of the Pilgrims about thirty-five years in England, Holland, and in the wilderness of America, and did the Lord and them faithful service in his place and calling."

Mr. Hunter has added very largely to our knowledge of the events of Brewster's life, although still obscurity hangs over many things which we should gladly know concerning him. He was born about 1560, if Morton correctly describes his age at the time of his death at 84; or about 1564, if Bradford be nearer the mark in speaking of him as nearly an octogenarian. He was, Mr. Hunter thinks, probably the son of a William Brewster who was assessed to the subsidy of 1571 in the township of Scrooby-cum-Ranskill. There were respectable families of this name in the counties of Lincoln, Essex and Suffolk. The Suffolk family were Puritan in their habits, and were connected in the time of Charles I. with Edmund Calamy and Matthew Newcomen, two of the authors of *Smectymnuus*. But what the connection was (if any) between the Brewsters of Suffolk and those of Nottinghamshire, has not been hitherto discovered even by Mr. Hunter.

William Brewster, whose story mingles with that of the Pilgrim Fathers, held an appointment in the service of William Davison, who fell a victim to the heartless intrigues and state craft of Queen Elizabeth, in the matter of the death of her cousin and rival, Mary the Queen of Scots. This appointment proves, as Mr. Hunter remarks, that Brewster must have been a man of some position by birth. He was faithful to his master in his fall, and remained some time with him to comfort and assist him. Ultimately he retired from public life, and found a retreat and employment at Scrooby. By a series of curious and singularly successful researches, Mr. Hunter has for the first time disclosed the nature of Brewster's employment. But we must give this in his own words. After complaining of the want of specialty which characterizes the writings of Governor Bradford, he proceeds:

"I would not say of Bradford, who appears to have been a very honest man, that there is *suppressio veri*; but he leaves us with the impression that Brewster had an independent fortune, and led a life without occupation, and that his whole time was devoted to the study of sacred things, and to acts of benevolence and devotion, when in reality the fact was much otherwise.



"That Scrooby was the place to which he removed, has been already shown; it is also shown who were some of the clergy with whom he must have associated: and I have now to add what has not before been surmised, that his life in this the active period was not one of meditation only, and acts of voluntary exertion, but that he held an important office at Scrooby, which must have made large demands upon his thoughts and time for things which were purely secular: and which brought to him a certain annual income, perhaps the best part of his revenues. This Bradford has not told us.

"I have already stated that Scrooby was a post-town on the great road from London to Berwick. It communicated with Tuxford on the south, and Doncaster on the north. It occurred to me when casting about for any possible source of information respecting this principal person in the movement, that this being the case, if any accounts of the Post-master-general of the time when Brewster lived were in existence, something might be found in them respecting him. Such accounts do exist: and in them I found not a few casual notices of Brewster as an inhabitant of Scrooby, but that *he himself held for many years the office of Post-master, or Post, as the term then was, at Scrooby.*"—Pp. 64—66.

By a reference to the accounts of the Postmaster-General, Mr. Hunter shews that Brewster was in possession of this office at Scrooby on the 1st of April, 1594, and that he continued to hold it till September 30, 1607, on which day he resigned it, and a successor was appointed.

"Now the holding this office explains to us in the first place how it happens that we find him inhabiting such a mansion as the Manor, which had been the residence of an archbishop, disproportionate we must believe to the circumstances of Brewster as a private man, but not so to one who had to keep relays of horses for forwarding the letters, and to find rest and refreshment for travellers on this the great highway to the north. The office of Post-master on the great roads in those days was one requiring more attention and bringing with it higher responsibilities than the same office does at present, when it is little more than the receiving and transmitting letters on a system well considered and already in full operation; but in those days there were no cross-posts, so that the few Post-masters who were dotted about the country had to provide for very distant deliveries, which must have been done by special dispatches, as well as to discharge the functions of the inn-keeper for the travellers *by post.*

"In Brewster's days Rowland Whyte the lively correspondent of many of the nobility of the time was the 'Post of the Court;' and it may serve to show other acquaintance at least of Brewster, if we state, that Henry Foster was during the whole of his time the post of Tuxford; John Heyford the post of Ferrybridge, and Nicholas Heyford, and after him Ralph Aslaby the post of Doncaster. Heyford and Aslaby were both names of respectable families in the south part of the West-riding of Yorkshire, corresponding in position, it may be believed, with the Brewsters. And this leads me to remark that though I cannot but wish that Bradford had informed us that Brewster held this office, yet that his holding it is by no means inconsistent with what Bradford does relate of him. It does not, for instance, invalidate his having been at the University, or his

having been in the service of a Secretary of State, and having fallen with his master. His holding this office is indeed rather favourable to these representations than the contrary, since it shows that he had some interest among those who were the dispensers of government patronage. Nor in such an office would he be precluded from nursing a brood of discontents, and from comparing political chicanery with the simplicity of the gospel, or from indulging in religious inquiry, religious meditation, and religious exercises. It would not prevent him from associating with the better part of the population around him, amongst whom there must have been many who were wrought upon by the preachers of whom we have spoken, or from being instrumental in bringing Puritan ministers to the neighbouring churches as they became vacant; and we may believe also that it supplied the means, in some measure at least, by which he maintained so much hospitality and did so much good by his purse. It does not appear in anything that is yet known of them that the Brewsters of Nottinghamshire had lands of their own, the chief source of income to gentlemen in those days who were not engaged in public employments." *Pp.* 68—71.

Whether Brewster's retirement from the office of Postmaster were voluntary or compulsory, in consequence of the displeasure of the Government with his Nonconformity, is not certainly known; but Mr. Hunter inclines to think it was forced rather than voluntary. We know that previously to this date the church was brought into order; that Robinson and Clifton were the pastor and teacher, and Brewster the elder; that the meetings of the church took place in his residence; that in April, 1608, he had been fined by the Commissioners for ecclesiastical causes for non-appearance to their citation; and that it was in August, 1608, that Clifton arrived at Amsterdam (*p.* 73).

The patronage afforded by William Brewster to the little church at Scrooby was invaluable. It appears from Governor Bradford's narrative, that his treatment of the worshipers who flocked to Scrooby was of the most liberal kind; "with great love he entertained them when they came, making provision for them to his great charge, and continued so to do whilst they could stay in England." Mr. Hunter describes with his accustomed felicity the importance of the services of Brewster:

"When Smith and his church had removed themselves to Holland, what was wanted by those persons who had come to the determination to break off from the communion of the general Church of England, and who did not choose to accompany or to follow Smith, was a central point at which they could assemble for worship and for discipline, and a central person about whom they might cling, and to whose guidance and judgment they might be willing to defer.

"And this seems to have been the position which was occupied by WILLIAM BREWSTER, which was at once what he desired and what was yielded to him by his simpler and less cultivated neighbours around. He fully sympathized with them and with the ministers of whom we have spoken, in his dislike of the ceremonies; his disapprobation of the

constitution of the church; his hatred of those measures of severity by which it was thought to extinguish the Puritan spirit; in his admiration of the Puritan life; and in his persuasion that there was in Scripture indications of the kind of form in which communities of Christians should be constituted sufficient to guide the practice of Christians in all times. And being a little raised above the rest in fortune, attainments, and social position, all we read of him seems to be but in the natural course of things, and had there been no Brewster at hand, it is probable that no Separatist Church would have been gathered after Smith and the Gainsborough people had withdrawn; but the Basset-Lawe mind would have returned to its former state of quietude when the generation which had been wrought upon by the over-zealous Puritan ministers had passed away."—Pp. 53, 54.

Our decreasing space prevents our going into much further detail respecting Brewster. We must content ourselves with reminding our readers that he took a chief part in the great pilgrimage. "When they were to remove out of the country," says Governor Bradford, "he was one of the first in all adventures and forwardest in any." He was taken prisoner at Boston, suffered the greatest loss, and was kept longest in prison, and afterwards bound over to the assizes. In Holland, he earned an honourable subsistence by giving classical tuition and working at a printing-press of his own. In America, he did not disdain, while his strength lasted, to "labour with his hands in the fields." When the church had no other minister, he taught twice every Sunday, and "that both powerfully and profitably, to the great contentment of the hearers and their comfortable edification."

His life was providentially extended far beyond the ordinary limits of human existence. His family was numerous. They took root in and still flourish in New England; and twelve months ago, Mr. Hunter informs us, "there was a meeting of gentlemen who claim the honourable distinction of descent from elder Brewster, at Norwich, in Connecticut, when it was resolved to adopt some special means to do honour to the memory of their common ancestor, and a committee was appointed for the purpose" (p. 44). One of the expected fruits of this meeting is a *Life of Brewster*, now in preparation by the Rev. Ashbell Steele.

We must not quit Scrooby without adverting for a moment to Archbishop Sandys, and his conduct in relation to this estate. Scrooby had been a usual residence of the Archbishops of York. It was used by Sandys himself. In 1582, he refused to grant a lease of it to the Queen, on the ground of the injury which its alienation would occasion to the see; yet immediately after, he granted a lease of the estate to his eldest son Samuel, which in fact amounted to a perpetual alienation of the property from the see of York. Mr. Hunter states the facts of the case with sufficient plainness to enable us to estimate the morality of the proceeding. Scrooby was not the only ecclesiastical spoil alienated to the Sandys family under the influence of that spirit of nepotism



which has in all ages existed among church dignitaries. There were twenty other leases of episcopal lands granted by the Archbishop to his sons. It is to his especial discredit that he was the first Protestant bishop who raised a powerful family by ecclesiastical plunder. His own and his sons' services in promoting ecclesiastical reform and liberal opinions, so far from justifying the wrong or modifying our feelings of disapprobation, ought to sharpen our censure of the wrong-doer, who knew better than most men of his day what was right and becoming. If we wanted language in which to express our opinions concerning church robbers, we could nowhere find words more strong and pointed on this topic than in the Archbishop's own sermons, especially that (the thirteenth in the collection printed in 1585) delivered at York on the occasion of a visitation, on Jesus overthrowing the tables of the money-changers, in which the preacher describes with much force "who be good shepherds and who be thieves." We owe to Mr. Hunter our knowledge of the misdoings of Sandys. The Rev. John Ayre, in his Biography of Sandys (Parker Society Publications), tells us that the Dean of York (Hutton) charged the Archbishop with providing for his family out of the revenues of the see; but adds, that Sandys strenuously denied the charge, declaring that he had but granted leases to his sons, which he must have granted to some, and that he was justified in giving to his own children rather than to strangers. He further tells us that in the end the Dean was compelled to make a submission. The result of those leases shews that the charge against the Archbishop was well founded, and that he little deserved the praise inscribed on his tomb at Southwell, "*Ecclesiæ patrimonium, velut rem Deo consecratam decuit, intactum defendit.*"

We concur cheerfully in the praises awarded by Mr. Hunter to two of the sons of the Archbishop,—George, the traveller and religious poet, and Sir Edwin, one of the most sensible writers on ecclesiastical affairs, and who was a friend of Brewster, and rendered the Scrooby church important aid by obtaining for them legal permission to emigrate to America. We hope the beautiful extract, which Mr. Hunter prints in the Appendix, from the *Europæ Speculum* of Sir Edwin Sandys, will draw public attention to that very remarkable book. Mr. Hunter quotes from the edition of 1687; but the first edition of the book, an unauthorized and very incorrect issue, was printed in 1605, but immediately suppressed; and the first authorized edition appeared in 1629.

We can only mention, in passing, that Mr. Hunter has given us much information respecting the persons who composed Brewster's church, having discovered many curious particulars respecting their family connections and their personal history. The facts elicited respecting the family of William Bradford, of Austerfield, afterwards the Governor of the first settlement of New

England, and whom he styles the Moses of the exodus, are full of interest.

We must not stay to analyze the remarks of Mr. Hunter respecting the history of John Robinson, the pastor of the Leyden flock. In his first edition, our author had suggested that Robinson's Norfolk cure was probably Mundham. Mr. Ashton, the editor of Robinson's Works, states, however, in the Memoir prefixed, that "from the records of the corporation of Norwich, and from the consignment or visitation book in the Bishop's office in that city, it appears the Rev. *Robert Robinson* and his son of the same name, were respectively incumbents from 1595 to 1608. The question, therefore, of John Robinson's connection with Mundham is finally settled in the negative."

We close our extracts by the just and forcible estimate Mr. Hunter takes of the character and spiritual ken of the Leyden pastor:

"He accompanied the Scrooby Church when it removed to Holland, was with it while it remained at Amsterdam, transferred himself with it to Leyden, and witnessed its departure for America, intending, it is understood, to go thither himself, though he never actually took that step. This was JOHN ROBINSON, who had inherited, like Smith, one of those names which are really in a large population like that of England, no *notamina*, affording, therefore, little assistance to the critical inquirer. But we know him to have been chosen into one of the highest offices in this church, and we know him, also, by the works which he left behind him, to have been a man of a superior cast of character to the men who were so outrageously zealous against ceremonies and vestments and external authority, all of which have their use in affairs of religion. He was, moreover, a man whose writings may be read now for instruction. I cannot go so far as some persons do and value his essays with those of Bacon; but he must be insensible indeed who does not acknowledge that there is no small amount of original thinking in them, and hints which may be applied by any man with advantage in the regulation of his thoughts and conduct. He was also a farther seeing man than some who were associated with him, seeing that having deserted the Church and renounced its authority, it was not to be supposed that they and their posterity would remain stationary precisely where they at first had rested, but that further light might be expected to be struck out by the labour of men of learning, and that it would be their duty as well as their privilege to follow the light that was vouchsafed to them. Historically, indeed, this has been eminently the case both in England and America, and has raised in both countries the question before the legal tribunals, how far men have a right to go in the pursuit of religious truth, who have renounced authority, and where the law shall step in and say,—Thus far shalt thou go and no farther. Such a man is deserving of honour, especially as he added to these something of the meekness of wisdom, much as compared with Smith and some other of the Separatists: 'the most learned, polished, and modest spirit that ever that sect enjoyed.' This is the testimony of Robert Baillie, of Glasgow, an eminent Scotch Presbyterian."—Pp. 90, 91.

Early in 1608, the purpose was taken by the Scrooby church to flee from the persecution which was kindled against them at home. They sought quietly to effect their object, one part endeavouring to embark at Boston, the other by the Humber. They were obstructed by fresh persecution at Boston, and a large portion of the Humber party were treacherously deserted by the captain of the vessel in which they had made preparations to sail. Their purpose of seeking in Holland that religious liberty which was denied them at home, was indomitable. They struggled through all their difficulties; and before the close of the year, all, probably several hundreds in number, assembled in safety at Amsterdam. Dissensions prevailed amongst the church of Smyth and his friends from Gainsborough, and, in the year following, the church of the Pilgrims removed to Leyden. Here they stayed till 1620. It was on the 5th of August in that year that the Mayflower set sail from Southampton. Their voyage lasted nearly five months; and during that time they endured, in an inconveniently crowded ship, all the sufferings of heat and extreme cold, of insufficient provisions and of terrific storms. At length the 22nd of December came (the birthday of New England), and they landed on the bleak rock of Plymouth. The 101 pilgrims who then landed, were in twelve months reduced to less than half the number; and when it is remembered how weak and worn they were by their voyage,—that their company included sea-born infants and men bent by the infirmities of age,—that they were without shelter, almost without means,—and that they were surrounded by not less than thirty savage tribes,—it may rather be matter of wonder that any survived, than that so many perished. But it was not the purpose of a wise and gracious Providence that these brave and righteous pilgrims should fail in their heroic undertaking. A glorious success was in store for them and their children and their children's children, and “a lasting lesson” for the whole world (as one of the most eloquent of their living sons has said) “of virtue, enterprize, patience, zeal and faith.”\*

We have now made the remarks which occurred to us as important on a careful perusal of these invaluable “Collections.” We have freely expressed dissent from some of Mr. Hunter's opinions; but we desire, before taking leave of his volume, to reiterate our appreciation of his historical integrity, and our warm admiration of his antiquarian lore, and his untiring industry in the search of new evidence, and the sagacity which characterizes his investigations of subjects, difficult from the scantiness of the facts, or embarrassed by apparently contradictory statements.

---

\* Edward Everett's Oration, delivered at Plymouth, Dec. 22, 1824.



## LETTERS AND PAPERS OF REV. JOHN SEDDON. No. III.\*

*Reasons for erecting an Academy for the Liberal Education of Youth, at Ormskirk rather than Warrington.†*

1. Ormskirk is thought a more pleasant and healthful situation, having more open streets and a better air.

2. It is reckon'd a town of better accommodations as to fire and provisions.

3. It is a place of less hurry and resort; where both teachers and students will be exposed to fewer distractions and avocations.

4. Nothing material is alledged, on the other side, for giving Warrington the preference in point of situation, but only the convenience of some particular persons: and private conveniency will always give way to public utility, when persons act from a public spirit, and with sincere disinterested views to a common good.

5. It was the settled opinion of the late Dr. Winder, that Ormskirk is the most proper place for an academy in these parts: and the late Mr. John Hardman declared, that any attempt to fix the intended academy at Warrington he would oppose with all his interest, as being, in his account, the most improper place for it in the whole county.

6. The only objection against Ormskirk of any weight, might probably have been removed long since by proper application, and possibly may yet be removed in less than half the time that has been lost, viz. the want of a convenient house; which the sticklers for Warrington seem willing to avail themselves of, by now pushing on the academy in all haste, after long delays. But,

7. If it shall be thought proper for the present to open an academy at Warrington, rather than lose any more time, unanswerable objections lie against fixing it there for a continuance, or any longer than such time as a convenient place may be procured at Ormskirk; as by the premises may appear.

*Rev. Richard Godwin to Rev. John Seddon.*

Allerton, April 28, 1757.

My dear Friend,—I send you inclosed two printed papers which will open a little farther the Dr.'s mind, and shew you that he is determined to push the opposition as far as it will go. The "Reasons" (which first came to my hands) are some of them *false*, others *dubious*, and all, whether true or not, *trifling* and *impertinent*. \* \* \* He (Mr. Brekell) has been another time at Ormskirk, but without acquainting me beforehand. \* \* \* Dr. Stanley's steward tells him that he makes no doubt but that the house may be taken, which has given him great hopes; but perhaps the steward considers his master rather as a landlord than a clergyman. However, the Dr. is written to upon the subject, and an answer is expected as soon as he returns from London, which will be in twelve days or a fortnight's time. I tell you this that you may make what use of it

\* Continued from p. 368.

† A printed broadside, undated, but probably issued by the Liverpool gentlemen in 1757. Another printed paper, alleging that the "Reasons for giving Ormskirk the preference are solid and just," has the signatures of Sam. Angier, Charles Goore, Will. Haliday, Benj. Heywood, Geo. Campbell, Tho. Wharton, Joseph Brooks, Wm. Lightbody and Adam Lightbody.

you think proper. But one thing let me say, that Cross Hall is likely to be the only bone of contention, and if you could remove that difficulty, the whole dispute must die away. \* \* \* Mr. B. and Mr. M. have wrote to each other upon the subject of the academy, and I believe Mr. B. designs to introduce the dispute at Bolton, so that you must if possible be there at the Provincial. You will greatly assist and encourage us, and cannot, I think, be better employed elsewhere. In short, Mr. Holland and I had a happy interview at Ashton last Tuesday, and one of the best things we concluded upon was, to lay our absolute commands upon you to be at Bolton the 17th of May at the latest, or to forfeit our friendship. I am, your sincere and affectionate friend,

R. GODWIN.

In a P.S., Mr. Godwin jocularly intimates his suspicions that his friend is on the eve of marriage, and adds,

However, let me retort upon you in my turn, "If you are not rash, I will not be angry." "The Fates are uncontrollable." Are they? But they draw you with a willing constraint, and therefore you are in some measure answerable for the consequences. I am only selfish, I think, in particular with my friends; for whenever you get a wife, I shall at least half lose a friend. However, I'll give you up, tho' with reluctance. But take (care?) that she loves you, and you love her above all earthly things; that she will meet your intimate friends with a smile, and behave with honour and propriety in her station.

Henderson dines with me this day, and preaches my lecture. He has lately received the severest letter from Evans I ever saw, and resents it accordingly, though he has not deigned to reply.

*Rev. Richard Godwin to Rev. John Seddon.*

Dear Mr. Seddon,—I send you inclosed my letter to S. B., having not courage to seal it up 'til it has had your perusal and sanction. I have hastily drawn it up this evening, and am now sensible that there is some difficulty in expressing our sentiments upon this subject in a sufficiently strong and guarded manner. I have not pleas'd myself, and heartily give you full liberty to make what use of it you think proper. The reason why I am thus straiten'd in time you'll find in Mr. Brekel's letter, which, as a curiosity, I also send you inclosed. His letter came to me on Tuesday morning. The day after, I went to Liverpool, and urged him to call the chief subscribers together to learn their sense of the matter; and that, if we must go to Ormskirk, it might be at their request and appointment. But I could not prevail upon him to agree with this proposal, and tho' I pressed him to give a reason, he obstinately refused. On Thursday morning we went to Ormskirk, with Mr. Henderson's company. In the afternoon we waited upon Mr. Oozey, whom we found in very low spirits. Mr. Brekel ask'd him several questions; viz., Whether the gentleman who own'd the house opposite to him would build conveniences for the academy, and let them out upon reasonable terms? He answer'd, He tho't not. Are there any houses in town already built which would serve the purpose? Not one. Would the subscriptions in Ormskirk in any measure supply the deficiencies in Warrington? He seem'd to think not. Would there be 5 guineas a-year? Probably not. At last, Cross Hall was mention'd, and Mr. Brekel, I believe, will write to Dr. Stanley about it. But you will be

under no fears from that quarter; for a clergyman of the Church of England will soon be aware how unpopular a step it must be to convert his own house into a Presbyterian academy. Mr. Oozey readily acknowledged that it would be an imprudent step to lay out, in the infancy of the academy, a great part of our small stock in building; and that, except Cross Hall could be obtain'd, the tho'ts of fixing it at Ormskirk must be entirely given up. He said, for his own part, he had almost forgotten the scheme of the academy, and talk'd with a good deal of coolness and indifferency about it. I am glad that Mr. Brekel has proceeded so far; for he himself will now be forced to give the best answer that cou'd be to those subscribers in Liverpool who incline to Ormskirk; and there are many who of late have expressed themselves with great warmth and earnestness in favor of it. After all, I have long observed a spirit of rivalry between the two towns, and this *now* shews itself amongst *us* more than ever. Several are daily complaining that the people of Manchester are for managing everything relative to the academy independently of others; that Liverpool is ignorant of all their measures, and have not once been consulted upon any one occasion. This is a popular objection, and must very soon be obviated, or else I am certain the ill effects of it will immediately appear. And I shou'd be glad if you cou'd prevail upon the committee at Manchester to write to the subscribers in Liverpool, and acquaint them with what has been done relative to the academy, and what they have now in view. Let them propose that a Committee be immediately chosen in Liverpool, that the two towns may from time to time correspond together upon anything of importance in this affair. And pray let this, if possible, be determin'd upon before you set out your journey. I heartily wish you a safe, pleasant and successful journey, and am, your sincere friend,

R. GODWIN.

*Rev. Philip Holland, of Bolton, to Rev. John Seddon.*

Dear Sir,—It is a disappointment to me to be depriv'd of the pleasure I promis'd myself from an interview with you and Mr. Godwin. The weather, it is true, is bad, and that, together with the cold our good friend complains of, must be deem'd a sufficient excuse. These things, tho' they occasion some delay in fulfilling, can't be thought to annul the promise. You will not think of putting off the visit longer than next Monday or the Monday following; the latter would be more agreeable to me on one account, as I should then hope you would contrive to come soon enough to preach my lecture; but you will object to it perhaps, as the fast-day is the Friday following, tho' that objection, perhaps, might be got over. Could we not contrive to join together in making a sermon for the occasion? But if you don't approve of this, it must be fixt, I believe, for Monday next. I leave you to settle it with Mr. Godwin, and shall depend upon your giving me notice when you are determin'd.

To my great surprize, I have not heard a word from Mr. Clarke, tho' it is now near a month since I wrote. If he has receiv'd my letter, it is, I think, a little ungenteel in him to take no notice of it. I shall mention it to Mr. Orton, to whom I intend to write this post, as perhaps he may have consulted with him about it.

I am obliged to you for sending me Dr. Taylor's letter. My senti-



ments of it, I durst lay a small wager, are very nearly the same with yours. There can be no doubt, I think, but he will undertake the care of the academy when invited to it; but I wish there will not be some little difficulty in finding him a colleague that he will approve of, and that he may not aim at too much in the business of lecturing. He does not think, I hope, that a tutor must make a confession of his faith before he is admitted to the chair. Does it not look too much like it, that he not only refers to his printed works, but proposes to send some manuscripts to be laid before the gentlemen at Manchester? This I think ought by all means to be oppos'd, as a precedent that may be of bad consequence. If it could be, it would be best a tutor's sentiments should not be known even by his pupils. The only qualifications for a tutor I can at present think of, are a particular acquaintance with the several schemes in the science which he professes to teach, and the strongest arguments by which they are supported; an accurate—[*cætera desunt*].

*Mr. Cheney Hart, of Salop, to Rev. John Seddon.*

The body of the letter relates to the destination in life of Mr. Witts, a student in the academy (No. 55 in Rev. W. Turner's List—M. Repos. IX. 205). Mr. Hart speaks of him as a nephew of Mrs. Hunt, of Boreatton,—names familiar to students of the history of Nonconformity in Cheshire and Shropshire. The postscript of the letter perhaps discloses to us the author of the "Christian Common Prayer."

Please to make my compliments to Mrs. Seddon, and also, when you answer this, let me know how your liturgy goes on at Liverpool or elsewhere. I hear General Brekel is mustering all his forces against the author of the Christian Common Prayer, who is not yet totally routed, but trusts he shall yet vanquish his furious but not formidable assailants. As long as truth and reason can remain superior to error and prejudice, that author has nothing to fear from a legion of interested hirelings. As the public have received the work well in general, let me hear the objections urged or suggested against it in your country. Mr. Brekell and Dr. Taylor's publisher are against every scheme of this kind. Brekell's performance would have been full of ungenteel and unjust criticisms and aspersions, but for the softening of his judicious friend whom he quotes, and whom you may believe to be J. O.\* of this place.

*John Mort, Esq., of Chowbent, to Rev. John Seddon.*

Chowbent, Jan. 9, 1762.

Dear Sir,—I cannot speak (as you know once was merrily said); you must therefore allow me sometimes to write. When I have little to do, 'tis an agreeable amusement; and to speak the truth, I often indulge in it something of vanity, which only the good-natur'd know how to excuse. I have little now to say to you but TAKE CARE OF YOURSELF. Was you meek as Moses, pious as David, perfect as Job, I cannot insure you'll now find their disease of malignity incurable. I expect not myself wholly to escape its dire effects. For the rest, refer you to the worthy bearer. Though we cannot overcome evil with good, let us continue (however difficult) the good Christian practise of doing good for evil. Adieu.

JOHN MORT.

---

\* Rev. Job Orton.

*Thomas Bentley, Esq., of Liverpool, to Rev. John Seddon.*

Mr. Bentley was a merchant of Liverpool, and afterwards became a partner of Wedgwood. Dr. Priestley, who knew him well, described him as "a man of excellent taste, improved understanding, a good disposition, but an unbeliever in Christianity." He was one of the most zealous promoters of the Octagon chapel and the new liturgy.

Liverpool, Feb. 6, 1762.

My dear Sir,—I thank you for your kind and friendly sympathy. I am so accustomed to gloom and disappointments, that I question whether my mind will ever recover its former cheerfulness. But in all circumstances, the kindness of my friends is a great satisfaction; and the firm belief of a wise and good Providence remains steady and unshaken, tho' of late it seems more a conclusion of the understanding than matter of experience. It is easy to believe well of nature, when we feel ourselves happy. To retain this sentiment in the days of affliction, is attended with much more difficulty; but I hope I shall always retain it.

In Mr. Knipe I have lost a very intelligent friend and an active partner, with *many* of the advantages proposed by his voyage; but I have sustained as little actual loss of property as possible under such an event; and tho' his papers are gone, I shall not be much at a loss about the accounts. He had fortunately made remittances in bills of the money he had collected.

I shou'd be extremely glad to have the pleasure of seeing you; but I have so much to do, I know not how to settle it. I cannot come to-morrow. I think, if you please, we'll meet at the Legs of Man, next to the church at Prescot, on Tuesday morning next. If you approve of this, write to me by return; and if anything to the contrary shou'd fall out between and to-morrow night, I'll write again. But I am extremely anxious about poor Mrs. Knipe, and want to hear from her. Perhaps I may be obliged to go over there in haste.

Let me hear from you to-morrow. I don't know whether what I write is very intelligible. My sisters join in respects to Mrs. Seddon, with your obliged, respectful and affectionate friend,

T. BENTLEY.

Dear and Rev. Sir,—I am sorry we are disappointed of the pleasure of meeting you to-day at Prescot. If next *Tuesday* or *Wednesday* will suite you, they will suite me and Mr. Godwin. Please to fix which day you like best by return of post, that I may inform Mr. Godwin on *Saturday*. It will save me the trouble of sending a messenger over to him.

The remarks made upon the part of the Liturgy we have, do not need to be convey'd by letter: they are few, and may be easily settled when we meet; except one, which I shall mention now, and that is with respect to the exhortations in general. I have considered them pretty carefully; and I am inclined to think they will not have the effect we at first expected. They will soon grow *flat*; much sooner than any other part of the *service*, which is indeed very chaste and yet animated.

Instead of the exhortations, I am persuaded we shou'd have the same sentiments express'd in a more laconic and oriental manner, by the help of suitable texts of Scripture. The same sentiments shou'd be excited without a formal exhortation, that we mean to excite with one. Perhaps

you may try the effect of some alteration of this kind; I think you will find it to be an improvement.

If it was not for the expence, I cou'd wish to have some *verbal* corrections made before the sheets are delivered into foreign hands; for *really* we are to expect little help but from our known friends. Dr. Dobson is a good critic; and tho' he has made some remarks, he is much pleased with the composition, and very sensible of its great perfection and accuracy. It will do lasting honour to the compilers; I should say *composers*, for it is much more than a compilation.

Before you see us, I wish you wou'd be prepared to give us leave to go upon the nomination of a minister. The building may be ready about Midsummer. You cannot think how pretty it looks now it is covered and the cupilo up. There is a bell, the gift of Mr. S. Green.

I suppose Mr. Mather will bring you the paper in Mr. Savage's hands.

With respects to Mrs. Seddon, I remain, your very affectionate friend and humble servant,

THOMAS BENTLEY.

Liverpool, March 16, 1762.

Dear and Rev. Sir,—We found it necessary to distribute the copies of the Liturgy amongst the subscribers. So far as I hear, most of them seem greatly pleased; I have not heard the contrary of any. Indeed, it is very full of excellent sentiment, often as well expressed; but in some places yet too diffuse, too luxurious in the language—a good fault, if I may be allowed to say so. It wou'd have been a poor-spirited work, if it had not admitted of pruning. I have number'd all I have deliver'd out, and taken a memorandum who they are gone to.

I wish you and your lady an agreeable journey. I wish you success in your good designs. The academy owes much, almost everything, to your care. Do you see what they are doing at Norwich? That friend of yours who writes in Lloyd's Chronicle, does not seem to be well informed of the situation of our affairs here; and I think him rather too flat; but he means well, and I find what we are doing will cause a general recollection of the almost obsolete principles of our Dissent, and may contribute in the end to the better explanation and more general understanding of the principles of liberty.

I fancy, for the sake of *correctness*, it will be necessary to print our Service in the country, for Mr. Griffiths, or Mr. Millar, or Mr. Dodsley, in London; and perhaps you will inform yourself on what terms any of these gentlemen will take the copies from us; for the demand *will be very great*, and it is not fit they shou'd run away with all the advantage.

Suppose you were to desire Mr. Griffiths to give one of your rough copies to the author of the literary article in the Library. He is an advocate for liturgys, and is probably a gentleman of good critical abilities.

I hope I may flatter myself with the pleasure of hearing from you while you are in London, and I shou'd be glad to be favour'd with your address there.

If you meet with a proper hand, do persuade somebody to give the Convocation Address a good *blow*. It is a fine opportunity for the friends of liberty to detect and expose the insinuating arts of priestcraft, and to condemn with manly eloquence such dangerous attempts to mix the logic of civil power with the thunders of the Church. What have we



not to dread from a body of men capable of making such an application to the State, and who are armed with such riches and influence! Indeed, that Address does really convince me that spiritual wickedness in high places wou'd be just as oppressive as it was formerly, if the prudence of the State and the progress of philosophy were not a check upon it.

May all happiness attend you! With respects to Mrs. Seddon, I remain, your most affectionate friend and humble servant,

THOMAS BENTLEY.

I hope you got the bags safe. Lea, the carrier, promised to take them under him.

Liverpool, April 12, 1762.

Dear and Rev. Sir,—Before this time I hoped to have had the pleasure of hearing from you. But the engagements that your situation and business produce, are a sufficient apology for so immaterial a neglect. I hope you go on well, and remove the prejudices that peevishness had insinuated into the minds of some good people against the impartial conduct of those who have managed the affairs of the academy.

And at the same time I cannot help feeling some anxiety for the reception of the Liturgy amongst your wise and intelligent friends. Here we go on very well and harmoniously, as the inclosed letter, which I have the honour of transmitting to you, will shew.

I hope it will meet with a favourable answer. The thing will not be unpopular here; our religious factions are not very violent; and if it was not for some good gentlemen that consider these matters as peculiarly affecting themselves, we might have proceeded almost without the appearance of opposition. I suppose we shall have Messrs. Heywoods in part. Mr. Holiday sent us word to the meeting that he approved the Liturgy very much, that he was not yet a member, otherwise he wou'd have given his vote for Mr. Seddon;—this without any application on our part that I know of, and before he cou'd certainly know that Mr. Seddon wou'd be proposed.

You will see by our letter that tho' the salary shou'd fall short two or three of the years, yet, if we can, we shall consider ourselves as obliged to make it up to one hundred pounds per annum from the surplus of the years following; but if you comply with our invitation, I think this deficiency will not exist two years, perhaps not one. And this regulation is so much better than what we first proposed, that I hope it will help to make up any loss you may sustain in the disposal of your house, &c.

I am yet of opinion that the Liturgy shou'd be printed near you for the sake of correction.

I lament with you the untimely death of our late worthy friend, Mr. Mather. When I say untimely, I speak as a short-sighted mortal. God knows best how to govern the affairs of the universe; we must submit.

Dr. Benson has also taken his leave of this world. Who will succeed him? I hear the best orator amongst the Dissenters in London is one Mr. Farmer. Have you heard him? Or are you always employed in preaching yourself?

Can you find out who your namesake J. S. is, that made that clever proposal about liberty in the Gentleman's Magazine? Pray see Thomson's monument in Westminster Abbey, and tell me whether it does honour to the designer.

But I beg your pardon; perhaps you have something else to do. When you have, I don't desire you to think about trifles; but we must not be always upon the full stretch. I approve, better than I practise, the Shandean philosophy: "Every time a man smiles, especially every time he laughs, he certainly adds something to the portion of this mortal life." Little amusements are as necessary as great pursuits.

I wish your draught of life may be composed of the most agreeable ingredients; and am, with respects to Mrs. Seddon, your affectionate friend,

THOMAS BENTLEY.

P.S. The letter of invitation cannot be sent by this post, as was intended, some of the gentlemen being out of town that shou'd sign it.

The letters which follow from Dr. Priestley derive additional interest from their date, being more than two years antecedent to the earliest of his letters gathered by his indefatigable biographer, the late Mr. Rutt.

*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Seddon.*

Warrington, April 9, 1762.

Dear Sir,—I am very much obliged to you for your friendly communication of your proceedings. I hope that, if you have a fair hearing, the representation you will be able to make of our affairs will not be without some good effect; however, our expectations here are not very sanguine. Prejudices, and particularly unfavourable and unjust prejudices, such as people are ashamed to have contracted, are not easily conquered, though *great is the power of truth*. By all means give us the earliest information of every step you take of importance. We cannot help being a little anxious about the success of your negotiation.

Everybody here has heard of your invitation to Liverpool. Poor Mr. Aikin (I have just been with him) is greatly alarmed at it. To speak with truth, I am not without apprehension myself, though I endeavour to keep up his spirits. But I am certain you will not determine rashly in so critical an affair.

We are much at a loss about our *Chemical Lecture*: five of our younger students are not permitted to attend it, and I have not the names of any of the subscribers out of the academy. When you write, do not forget to mention them.

You will oblige me if you will take the trouble to procure for my friend, the vicar, the glasses he mentions in the letter which (to save transcribing) I enclose you. Could you not engage Mr. Canton to examine them, as you will see it requires a good deal of exactness? You will easily get a frank in London to return it me in.

I am very angry with *Mr. Fleming*. Let me know whether you think it will do us any harm. You may let me know what *Mr. Kippis* says about St. Paul; but I shall hardly listen to any scheme of publication. Indeed, Mr. Seddon, it is too great a risque for a person in my circumstances and with my views to run. I have known the time when nobody was a more fearless freethinker than myself; but *tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*. Could I afford it, I should not be averse to printing it, and lodging it in the hands of a few friends; but you know I can do no such thing.

I beg you would discharge *my account of books* with *Mr. Griffiths*.

After I had written the above, which was late last night, I received

your second letter this morning. What I have done, the enclosed will shew; it was all I have attempted yet. Upon the receipt of yours, I invited all the students in divinity to drink a dish of tea with me, and, in the mean time, drew up the report, and got *Mr. Threlkeld* to transcribe it. It was signed with all the readiness and cheerfulness in the world, with the most cordial wishes that it, or anything else they could do, might have a good effect. *Mr. Threlkeld* read it distinctly, and *Mr. Palmer* took it into his hand, and perused it a considerable time with great attention, and signed it when it came to his turn without the least hesitation. I talked to them above an hour upon the state of the academy, going over every particular. I inquired into all *Mr. Aikin's lectures*, and *Mr. Palmer* was generally the first to express his pleasure and satisfaction in them. I desired they would with all freedom mention, now or at any time, any objection they had to anything respecting the conduct of the academy, assuring them it would be heard with the most favourable attention, for that we were extremely desirous to give them all the advantage and satisfaction that it was possible they could have in such a situation. They said they were very far from having any objection to make. I asked them particularly if there was any appearance of your ever interfering in an undue manner in the management of the academy, or of our having any connection with the scheme of the *Liverpool Liturgy*, or in any respect endeavoured to lay any bias upon their minds, or had any other view but their improvement, with a great deal to that and the like purpose. They said, by no means. Nothing could have given me greater satisfaction than their whole behaviour.

I will talk to *Mr. Palmer* more closely after a few days. I have not followed your direction exactly. To have singled him out at first, I thought, might have alarmed him, and given him suspicions of my intelligence; and then I should not have been able to procure even thus much. I can better remonstrate against his conduct a little time hence, as inconsistent with this frank declaration. I shall probably wait till I hear from you again before I proceed any further.

This evening, likewise, *Phil. Taylor* communicated to me his father's intention of removing him to Exeter, and shewed me his letters. We both shed tears; I could not help it. He is leaving us presently.

Your letter came when I was at *Mr. Holt's* at breakfast. *Mr. Aikin* soon heard of it, and came and sat some time with me. I mentioned no particulars. You had not need to caution me. I durst not tell him; it would affect him too much. He desires you would inquire whether *Dr. Doddridge's lectures* were printing.

By the way, when I mentioned *Mr. Aikin's* intention of reading *Dr. Doddridge's* divinity lectures, printed or not printed, *Mr. Palmer* replied, "I am glad I have transcribed them; I should be sorry to be obliged to transcribe them now."

*Mr. Holt*, if you remember, mentioned a *solar microscope*. I wish you could meet with *Banier's Mythology* second hand.

We are infinitely obliged to you for the generous pains you take to serve us. We will do our duty here, and let not your noble courage be cast down. Yours and Mrs. Seddon's with reciprocal warmth,

JOSEPH PRIESTLEY,

All our compliments and good wishes await you,



*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Seddon.*

April 10, 1762.

Dear Sir,—Afraid of having omitted giving you any advice I might have thought of in the present critical conjuncture, I put you to the expense of a post letter to desire you would by no means neglect getting the report signed by Mr. Calamy. Further, would it not answer an exceeding good purpose to get him introduced to the Fund, or the managers of it? The clear evidence of so respectable a youth could not but have its weight even with persons who were not absolutely impartial. I have no doubt of his willingness to serve us. I am afraid I have been so inattentive as to send the report without the date; but you may safely venture upon my authority to date it "Warrington, Good Friday, April 9th." If there be occasion, I can produce vouchers enough. I am upon uncommon good terms with Mr. Palmer, and will take care to improve it, so as to avoid giving him any cause to suspect my views. The use I shall make of it shall be what you direct. I continue determined to wait till I hear from you before I come to a declaration with him. Not a syllable hath transpired of your late despatches. I am, in haste, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Seddon.*

Warrington, May 1, 1762.

Dear Sir,—We are very impatient to know the progress of your negociation, and how long you propose to be absent from us. I take it for granted you have before this time received the invitation from Liverpool. I cannot help wishing that you and our friends had conducted that affair with more secrecy. Whether you will listen to the invitation, is the subject of much and various speculation at Warrington. I can hardly tell which sentiment is more common; but we all agree in this, that in case you should leave us, it is impossible the congregation should ever be so well provided again. To speak my sentiments with that absolute freedom with which you have always indulged me, I think that Mr. Holland's settling at Warrington would not be of any service to the affairs of the academy. With inferior talents and address, he is no less obnoxious to the enemies of liturgies than yourself.

I am seriously preparing for *ordination*. As all things in this world are uncertain, I think it a point of prudence not to omit anything that may possibly be of advantage to me, if ever it be my lot to have recourse to the ministry for the whole or any part of my subsistence, particularly as I am going to have a dearer and more important stake in this world than I have ever yet had in it. I can sincerely say, I never knew what it was to be anxious on my own account; but I cannot help confessing I begin to feel a good deal on the account of another person. The hazard of bringing a person into difficulties which she cannot probably have any idea or prospect of, affects me at times very sensibly.

We seem to be going on very well among ourselves. On Monday next, Mr. Holt and I both remove into our new houses, which I hope are ready to receive us. *Mr. Aikin* is in good health, but inclined now and then to look upon the dark side of our prospect. I find no inconvenience, but rather a pleasure, in officiating as your curate, which is a title everybody gives me, and which I am very proud of. I have spoke over the grave of two persons at the chapel, and another at Hill Cliff.

The last was the wife of one Charles Hayes. I preach her funeral sermon to-morrow. The perquisite I reserve for you, *sub ejus auspiciis acquisivero*.

About a fourth part of my Lectures are printed off. Aires is too slow; but he has no help; his boy has left him. I am afraid we shall be able to keep no measures with Mr. and Mrs. —. I find by Mr. Threlkeld and Mr. Stapp that they have not been backward to take opportunities to insinuate into their minds everything they can to the prejudice of the academy. It will answer no good purpose to keep any measures either with them or their brother long: they are a set of implacables. *Mr. Harwood* has lost *Mr. Pope* by his letter to him in our favour.

I am, with the most perfect esteem and affection, dear Sir, your friend and servant,  
J. PRIESTLEY.

My respectful compliments to Mrs. Seddon. I hope she spends her time to her satisfaction in London.

P.S. I shall be obliged to you if you will ask Mr. Griffiths whether it will suit him to take any or all of the books I enclose you a catalogue of, and upon what terms. \* \*

*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Seddon.*

Warrington, May 6, 1762.

Dear Sir,—The favourable intelligence of your last hath put new life into all. You cannot imagine with what pleasure *Mr. Aikin* heard of your being for the future considered in the same light with other academics, and of there being a prospect of receiving students with exhibitions from the Presbyterian Fund. Suppose the London exhibition should be granted for Mr. Palmer for Warrington. He only meant to procure a larger exhibition, and you can prove that (he?) is very well satisfied with his present situation.

[There follow some statements respecting the painful discussions which had once gone on in the academy, a grateful reference to the "perfect harmony and mutual confidence" then subsisting "among all concerned in the academy," and a statement of the declaration which the Dr. had made to a third party, of the great esteem and perfect confidence he felt towards his correspondent, and how much he thought himself honoured by his friendship.]

We long for your return; but by all means stay while you have any prospect of doing good. I shall most cheerfully do the little I am able to do towards supplying your place here.

Suppose, when you leave London, you could take with you some certificate from Dr. Chandler of his approbation of our affairs.

Your congregation will draw up an address to you upon the subject of your invitation to Liverpool, which we hope will have its weight with you. If they tender it to us, we, as part of your congregation, shall most cheerfully sign it.

It gives me a most sensible pleasure to find that you regard the letters *Mr. Houghton* sent you in a light so favourable to me. \* \* Your *salmon* was sent on Friday; it was impossible to get one before; they have been uncommonly scarce. *Mr. Aikin* desires I will remind you of *Dr. Doddridge's lectures*.

I am, with respectful compliments to Mrs. Seddon, yours sincerely,  
J. PRIESTLEY.

Dr. Priestley to Mr. Seddon.

Warrington, May 19, 1762.

Dear Sir,—Upon receiving your letter, I had come to a resolution not to be ordained. But when Mr. Mottershead and others had heard that I had talked of it, they desired me by all means to proceed with it. They said they should be glad to receive me as one of them, and that I might concur with them in their proceedings on this or the like occasions, which, while I was not ordained, I could not do. This, and neither Mr. Holland nor any of our friends seeming to be in the least aware of the objection you mentioned, together with the present opportunity of doing it with the least noise and suspicion possible, determined me to stand up with the rest. Mr. Aikin also had always encouraged me, and said that perhaps none but ourselves would think of that objection.

Mr. Harwood was here, and, as I perceived, with a view to be ordained; but I would not understand his meaning, and he did not care to propose it himself. He shewed me and Mr. Aikin a letter from Mr. Pope, in which, like Mr. —, he solemnly disclaims his having used any methods to lessen the subscriptions to the academy; but, like him, threatens that, if the managers of the academy continue to reflect upon his conduct, he will immediately publish — letters, with his own comments. \* \*

I perceive you have dropped your design of going to Bristol, as you mention your being here so soon. Would it not be proper to go, if not at present, yet very soon, thither? I hope that, before you leave London, you will not forget to engage some person to collect the subscriptions regularly. Do you hear of any students for us? Mr. Witts has received notice to go immediately to a Portuguese house in London, in order to be ready at a day's warning to go to the East Indies. He is the eighth that we have lost since I came, and we may expect to lose more than that number at the vacation. I think I told you that poor Forrest was dead.

I shall be very much obliged to you if you can buy, either for me or the library, *Sharpe's Dissertations on Language* and *Banier's Mythology*. I hope you will not forget to inquire after Dr. Doddridge's lectures. Mr. Brereton's glasses you may send to him directly by the Chester machine. \* \* I enclose you a letter from Mr. Holland, and the paper signed by the ministers of the Provincial. It had passed in a much more agreeable form, if it had not been for the idle cavils and caprice of Mr. Brekel.

I want much to have some conversation with you on the subject of Liverpool. I cannot really help being against your leaving us; but I am not fit to direct your better judgment. When I see you, I will tell you all my reasons.

I am, with respectful compliments to Mrs. Seddon, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

Your servant doth not know what to do with the cask of porter. She hath not bottles enough by several dozens.



## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Remains of the late Edward Copleston, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff.* With an Introduction, containing some Reminiscences of his Life, by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. Pp. 327. London—Parker. 1854.

We gave in a former volume (VII. 661, 1851), when reviewing the Memoir written by his nephew, some account of Bishop Copleston. The volume now before us, by his pupil and friend the Archbishop of Dublin, does not enable us to add any important biographical fact to those previously stated, except that Dr. Copleston was in part author of the *Treatise on Logic*, which bears the name of Dr. Whately. We give the account of this literary co-partnership in the Archbishop's words:

"I well remember submitting to him, above 40 years ago, in the rough state, my observations on the distinction between *cause* and *proof*, and on the importance, so generally overlooked, of attending to it. He remarked playfully, that he was mortified at what I shewed him, for that he had the same thing in his *Commonplace-book*, and had supposed it to be exclusively his own; and that he had the design of one day publishing something on the subject. I afterwards consulted him on several other points, which are treated of in the work just referred to (*Whately's Treatise on Rhetoric*). But on the whole, the assistance I derived from him in that work was considerably less than in the *Treatise on Logic*. His share in this latter was so great, that, as is set forth in the Dedication and in the Preface, it may be considered as his work and mine in about equal proportions. And yet, being prepared for the press and actually published by myself, most persons seem to have totally overlooked the circumstance that he had any share at all in it. I have frequently made the remark, and sometimes to himself, that this may, perhaps, be in part attributed to the very openness with which I acknowledged, and prominently put forward, my obligations to him in that work (which may sufficiently explain and justify (?) the omission of all mention of it in the *Memoir*); and that, if I had suppressed or endeavoured to extenuate those obligations, some persons would perhaps have taken a pleasure in investigating the question, whether the work was as much my own as it professed to be, and in collecting (which would not have been difficult) indications from the Bishop's conversation and writings, of my having in reality borrowed much from him."—Pp. 89, 90.

Of the Reminiscences of Bishop Copleston now offered to the world, we will speak after we have described the "Remains" now published. They consist, first, of extracts from his *Commonplace-book*, chiefly on Logic; secondly, of Sermons; and thirdly, of Two Lectures, part of a series called the *Bosworth Lectures* (from the name of the founder of the lectureship) at Oriel College. The essays on Logic are characterized by all the acuteness of thought and precision of statement which habitually belonged to Dr. Copleston. The sermons, thirteen in number, are academic rather than popular, but at the same time display the theological knowledge and the liberal spirit of their writer.

The first, entitled, "The Promise of the Life that now is," aims to shew that in the dispensation of temporal blessings there is not that entire difference between the Jewish and the Christian economy for which Bishop Warburton argued. He was indeed quite at one with Warburton in believing that Moses could not have led the Jews to expect immortal life as the reward of obedience, and was astonished at the popular outcry which "the herd of commonplace divines" have raised against that idea.

In the second sermon, entitled, "The Better Things," he enters at large into the explanation and defence of Warburton's main position. Of Warburton's faults and wrongs he thus justly speaks:

"But although the main outline of this great writer's argument appears to me not only original and important, but impregnable as the truth itself, yet I am far from denying that the work contains many blemishes and many errors. Of his arrogance and offensive petulance towards his opponents, no justification can be attempted. The only extenuation is to be found in the injurious treatment he himself received, and in that keen sense of wrong and ingratitude which a generous mind feels when valuable services are requited with reproach, and when some feeble adversary succeeds, by misrepresentation and clamour, in kindling the passions and prejudices of mankind, in drawing away their attention from the real points at issue, and in making their benefactor become the object of popular odium."—P. 152.

Dr. Copleston declines to follow Warburton in his rational opinion, that expiatory sacrifice is not to be regarded as a divine or even a positive institution. We accept, indeed, the former's concession, that "the doctrine of piacular atonement through the sacrifice of an animal victim is a notion which can never be traced up to the working of nature herself" (p. 155); but we demur to his conclusion, that the universal prevalence of the practice is therefore to be traced up to revelation. With more of dogmatism and less of charity than was his wont, he asserts (p. 156), that the "Socinian" is separated from the true church of Christ by his rejection of the doctrine that the sacrifice of Christ is the only door by which admission is gained to heaven.

The fourth sermon is an ingenious essay on the disappointed expectations of the first disciples, and the conclusions drawn tend to confirm the evidences of the reality of Christ's resurrection.

In the fifth and sixth discourses, entitled, "The fuller Instruction of Apollos," there is a thoughtful and very rational description of the relation which Judaism bore to Christianity, and it is shewn how gradually and naturally the one was moulded and elevated into the other. There is throughout these discourses, however, a complete ignoring of those doctrines of so-called *orthodoxy*, from which the Jewish mind has always recoiled. The Christian's belief here recognized by Dr. Copleston is such as "is often expressed in a brief form of words," and "intelligible almost to a child." This, however, is not the description of two at least of the three creeds contained in the Book of Common Prayer. Incidentally, Dr. Copleston strongly opposes the idea of the future restoration of the Jews to their patrimony, or that they are destined as a nation to act any further important part on the earth. We wonder, indeed, that such a retrograde motion could ever have seemed probable to enlightened minds; yet the idea has captivated eminent men in almost every church, including amongst them our own Priestley.

In the seventh sermon, we find an exposition of the parable of the Unjust Steward. Dr. Copleston ascribes the difficulty felt in relation to this parable, to the mistake of supposing that all men are stewards only of their worldly property, exactly in the same way that the steward of the parable was to his lord. The point of imitation and instruction is the steward's anxiety for the future. Not in all its circumstances is the conduct of the steward proposed as a model of imitation. "He is represented in his anxiety for the future as setting at nought even moral

principle, when it stood in the way of his main purpose. His *duty* was violated that he might serve his *interest*. Our duty and our interest go hand in hand."

The only other sermon in the series which we need to notice, is that on the Marriage in Cana, which is disfigured by the unnatural conceit, so little in keeping with its author's habitual sobriety of mind, that the wine and the water were types or symbols of the blood shed on the cross, and particularly of the blood and water which issued from the side of Jesus on the cross. He finds in the combination of the wine and water and the miracle, a type of the *three witnesses* afterwards spoken of by John. According to this process, any doctrine, from transubstantiation downwards, may be proved by any language or any act.

Of the two lectures, one on the Church, the second on the Church of England, we have only this to say:—they are the work of a resolute Churchman, and yet discard the theory of apostolic succession.

The Reminiscences are thoroughly egotistical, and tell us much more of Archbishop Whately than they do of Bishop Copleston. We are not disposed to complain of this. We feel considerable interest in the opinions of an enlightened man, and, for an Archbishop, a very courageous theologian, like Dr. Whately. We are glad to see some of the positions which he habitually takes, strengthened by the name and authority of Dr. Copleston. It will be an evil day for the Church of England when the rational views of Scripture held by such men as Whitby, Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Jortin, Maltby and Whately, shall be exclusively held by those who are not of her communion.

A few passages culled from the Reminiscences, will shew at how many points we are in agreement with the more thoughtful and liberal exponents of Church-of-England theology.

#### *On the Obligation of the Levitical Code.*

"I know not what was his opinion of the interpretations (very forced and non-natural as they appear to me) which have been given of the Mosaic Law as to this point, by those who have dragged the Pentateuch into this controversy. But I am certain that he, in *common with the very persons* who have appealed to what they call 'the divine law,' in this matter, never considered the ceremonial or the civil regulations of the Levitical Code as binding on *us*. No one considers himself bound by that to abstain from the forbidden meats, or from selling land in perpetuity, or to require any one to marry his brother's widow. Nay, even what are confessedly *moral* duties, no Christian Legislature has felt bound in all cases to enforce by its own laws. Disobedience to parents, for instance, and gluttony and drunkenness, no one would deny to be moral offences; and yet no Legislature denounces against them the penalty of *death*."

"The whole, therefore, of the appeal to the Mosaic Law is manifestly irrelevant, even on the showing of the very persons who have got up this topic of declamation; for the purpose, apparently, of diverting attention from the real points at issue."

"The civil and ceremonial ordinances of that Law can thus far, and only thus far, be taken as a guide; namely, that anything which is not merely permitted, but distinctly enjoined, in the Law, cannot be at variance with the immutable principles of morality. If, for instance, the marriage of a brother and sister in law had been in itself an incestuous union, it would never have been (as it is) enjoined in a certain case by the inspired lawgiver."

"And as for the appeals which some have made to Canons and Decrees, &c., of some ancient Councils and Churches on the subject, one cannot but think these must have been designed to captivate unthinking and ill-informed



hearers, and had no weight at all in the minds of those who resorted to such an argument, and who must have known (which some of their hearers probably did not) that similar authorities might be brought forward against *second marriages* of the clergy—against the marriage of *cousins*, &c.”—Pp. 39—41.

*Truth will triumph in the End.*

“‘When reason is against a man,’ said Hobbes, ‘he will be against reason.’ But it may always be anticipated that reason, when once men have generally understood and allowed on which side it lies, will before long prevail. Error on any point may, indeed, bear rule for an indefinite time while undetected; but when its real character is fully known, the days of its reign are numbered. Not that its practical overthrow is, even then, *immediate*. Sound principles must not only be brought into notice and clearly explained, but must afterwards be allowed some *time* to become familiar to men’s minds, before they will be acted on. The words which Shakspeare puts into the mouth of Dogberry, probably in mere careless sport, may be taken as a correct description of what actually takes place in many departments of life: ‘It hath been *proved* already that you are stark knaves; and it will go near to be *thought so* shortly.’ Adam Smith lived to see his doctrine of free trade acknowledged to be sound by all the most intelligent men; but it was reserved for another generation to bring it into practice in legislation. The system of stocking new colonies with the sweepings of jails, after having been vainly denounced by Lord Bacon, and afterwards by Howard, was fully and unanswerably exposed as indefensible about a quarter of a century ago; and at length there seems reason to expect that its inexpediency will before long be generally and practically admitted. ‘It hath been proved already that the system is utterly bad; and it will go near to be thought so shortly.’”—Pp. 45, 46.

*Sabbatical Ideas.*

“All persons even tolerably acquainted with the Bible and Prayer Book are aware, that in neither is the Lord’s-day ever called the Sabbath. But many are not aware of the extremely recent origin of what Calvin called the ‘Anglican figment’—the tradition (nearly unknown for the first fifteen centuries and more) of the commandment respecting the Sabbath having been *transferred* by the authority of the Apostles from the seventh day of the week to the first; though even now, in all Latin documents (such as the Parliamentary proceedings), ‘*Dies Sabbati*’ always means Saturday.

\* \* “I do not differ from those who maintain what are called the Sabbatarian views, as to the *duty* of observing the Lord’s-day, but only as to the *grounds* of it. It is no difficult matter for an unscrupulous disputant to confound these two questions together, and thus to mislead those of his hearers (probably four-fifths of them) who have never read what I have published on the subject, and will, therefore, fail to detect the misrepresentation.”—Pp. 51, 52.

*Resist the Beginning of Corruptions.*

“According to the proverb which Lord Bacon has somewhere alluded to, ‘*nettle-roots*’ sting not. The first entrance of some false principle, or of some usurped power, is generally in reference to something either harmless or else unimportant; and when the *root* has once got possession of the soil, it will afterwards send up stronger and stronger shoots. Thus the claims of Papal Rome originated in the natural deference felt for the Church of an imperial city, and a disposition to consult that Church on various questions that arose. And when this had grown into an established custom, and the decisions of Rome, when right, or when relating to matters of minor consequence, were appealed to as decisive, the thin end had been inserted of the wedge, which was gradually driven in further, till at length the Pope came to be regarded as Christ’s Vicegerent on earth.”

The record of the fact that Bishop Copleston discountenanced the

persecution to which Dr. Hampden was exposed on his elevation to the see of Hereford, gives Archbishop Whately an opportunity of reviewing the circumstances connected with that clerical rebellion. He thus pithily describes the circumstances and the character of the Puseyite party :

"A number of persons (several of whom have since joined the Church of Rome), professing emphatically 'Church principles,' assembled in a kind of self-constituted synod, and denounced a brother minister of their own Church as heretical, and ultimately induced the Oxford Convocation to pass a vote which there is strong reason to believe was utterly illegal, though the apprehension of ruinous expenses prevented the question being brought to trial."

The character of the Puseyite party is added as a note :

"Of the party which at that time was just beginning to be organised under the guidance of a certain band of 'conspirators' (this is the term applied to them *by one of their own number*), the course has always been (1) to profess excessive submission to the authority of the Church, and veneration for Bishops, who were thus likely to be deceived into the belief that this Party would prove a faithful and obedient, though perhaps somewhat over-zealous supporter; (2) to represent the Church as consisting of *themselves* and their adherents, coming forward on various occasions (as lately in reference to Bishop Gobat), in an unauthorized and irregular manner, to pronounce decisions where they were not entitled to any jurisdiction; and (3) to treat all their brother ministers, and especially all Bishops, who did not agree with them, sometimes with utter neglect, and sometimes with the grossest insolence." \* \* "They remind one of Addison's 'Tory Freeholder,' who declared, 'I am for passive obedience and non-resistance; and I will oppose to the utmost any Ministry and any King that will not maintain that doctrine.'"

We will bring this article to a close by extracting what Dr. Whately says of those transcendental Christians who ignore all the leading facts of the gospel histories. He is speaking of the declaration, "On the faith of a Christian,"—the slight but effectual (except in the case of Mr. Disraeli) bar which keeps Jews out of Parliament.

"Bishop Copleston, however, and most of the rest who framed the declaration in question, would probably have attached little importance now to the introduction of the word 'Christian,' if at least they were aware how fashionable it has become among a certain transcendental school to profess a belief in Christianity, themselves explaining their meaning to be, that Jesus Christ was a divine Messenger in the same sense that Socrates and Confucius and Mahomet and Oliver Cromwell, and all other eminent men, may be called such; that the Gospel narrative is partly true history and partly myth; and that our Scriptures contain much valuable matter mixed up with much that is absurd or pernicious.

"I am not speaking, it is to be observed, of hypocritical pretenders—of men who profess what they do not believe. Against such, no one could have thought of securing us by any form of declaration. But the persons I am speaking of, are such as frankly and without disguise explain what they mean when they call themselves Christians, which is evidently something that falls much more short than Judaism does, of Christianity properly and usually so called."—P. 48.

In a note, quoted from *Cautions for the Times*, No. XXIX., the Archbishop explains that he does not deny the title of Christian to an Unitarian. The book just named has strong claims on our early attention and that of our readers.

## SINGLE SERMONS AND LECTURES.

1. *The Unitarian Position: a Sermon preached at Warrington, June 22, 1854, at the 209th Anniversary of the Provincial Assembly of Presbyterian and Unitarian Ministers of the Counties of Lancaster and Chester.* By Charles Beard, B.A. To which are added the Prayers used on the same Occasion, by Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A.

OF this thoughtful and eloquent discourse we have already, in reporting the proceedings of the venerable Assembly before which it was delivered, given an analysis. The impression which it made on delivery is amply sustained on perusal. The characteristics of the different sections of the Christian church in England are happily described, and it is strikingly shewn how the singularity of the Unitarian position constitutes its sufficient justification. While doctrines that are unscriptural and a spirit which is narrow and unchristian prevail around us, we have no course open to us, in the assertion of what we believe to be Christian truth, but to continue to be a sect, although we may, and we believe do, generally avoid the sectarian spirit. In following the worship commanded by revelation, we cannot avoid the way which other men choose to call "heresy." Mr. Beard, in this discourse, strikes indirectly a heavy blow against the sickly *non-sectarianism* which has recently raised its feeble voice amongst us, and which, were it to lead captive the Unitarian body, would put back the cause of free inquiry and theological reform, and give us over, bound hand and foot, to the enemies of truth and freedom. It is satisfactory to see this question handled, and with remarkable ability, before two important religious meetings, one in London, the second in Lancashire, by Mr. Higginson and Mr. Beard. Sometimes language is used, and even in quarters where it would be least anticipated, implying that portions of "orthodox" theology supply higher spiritual motives and influences than the simple faith of the Unitarians. This we deny. If we were compelled to admit it, we should begin to doubt the truth of our theology. Mr. Beard on this subject well says, that no "Unitarian who bears a grateful heart to God, the kind Father, and walks reverently in the steps of Christ, the perfect Friend, will admit that the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity can supply impulse so noble, consolation so effectual, hope so bright, faith so steadfast." And this statement is justified by all that follows in this fine discourse respecting the nature and the grounds of the Unitarian faith.

2. *God's Word through Man's Agency destined for universal spread: a Discourse preached before the Supporters of the West-Riding Tract and Village Missionary Society, in the Westgate Chapel, Wakefield, on Wednesday, June 14th, 1854, at their Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting.* By William Forster, Pastor of the Free Christian Church, Kentish Town, London.

THIS discourse, like everything we have seen of Mr. Forster's, is sensible, earnest and practical. Delighted with the simplicity of his new faith and its answerableness to all the wants of his understanding and his heart, he naturally is anxious to diffuse it amongst his fellow-creatures. We may think that he has scarcely realized the difficulties from popular ignorance, the force of prejudice and the seductions of interest, which Unitarian Christianity has to encounter, but we should be sorry



to abate, by any remarks of ours, any man's zeal for Christian truth and religious reformation. Let him go forth and proclaim, from the pulpit and through the press, the simple truths of the gospel, and it is our anxious desire that he should be encouraged and aided in his enterprize by the Unitarian body. Mr. Forster is a very plain speaker, and we like him all the better for it. He will probably smile at the exception we are now and then disposed to take to the introduction of words and phrases, never coined in the pulpit mint, such as "sham," "wide-awake," "making a fuss," &c. But we think that plain thoughts are best expressed in language which never approaches to bombast, nor descends into colloquial familiarity and the region of *slang*. Dr. Parr went so far as to rebuke Mr. Belsham for using the word which we find in Mr. Forster's title, *spread*, which he said Priestley too much used, but which all men of taste repudiate.

3. *Mr. Ierson's Lectures.* 1. *The Sacred Things of Nature.* 2. *The Kingdom of Heaven.*

THESE are the titles of the first of a series of monthly lectures by Mr. Ierson, the minister of the congregation of the South-Place chapel, Finsbury. They are the utterances of a man of a kindly nature and a poetical temperament, who has looked at Christianity chiefly through its corruptions, and who, like other assailants of revealed religion, habitually ignores the existence of a free and rational Christian theology such as Unitarianism presents. That Mr. Ierson will largely extend the boundaries of religious thought and knowledge, we do not think probable. He rejects the divine commission of Jesus Christ, and teaches his flock to believe that Christ was led into serious errors by "the influence of the Essene discipline;" also that he was very ignorant of the laws of nature, and exaggerated into disorder and evil whatever he did not happen to like; also that, through the same ignorance, he was led to suppose "that God must resort to the extraordinary method of miracle, in order to accomplish any great changes in the human character and destiny." To the "logic of ignorance," and the want of power to anticipate the "doctrine of scientific philosophy," Mr. Ierson attributes Christ's supposed doctrine of the future destination of the unconverted. Happily, there are far better things in these lectures; and moral and religious truths are not unfrequently deduced as the results of what we suppose their author regards as scientific philosophy, which we have long valued as essential parts of revealed Christian doctrine.

4. *On that Department of Public Worship which consists of Singing or Psalmody: a Discourse delivered in Park-Lane Chapel, June 25, 1854.*  
By Francis Knowles, Minister of the above Place.

THE subject of this discourse is interesting, and it is discussed by Mr. Knowles with much fervour. In the county of Lancaster, more than other parts of England, the practice of psalmody falls in with the natural taste and habits of the people. If Mr. Knowles is strictly correct in his position, that the minister is necessarily "the director of the singing as of the other parts of devotion," music ought to be made one of the branches of study in our colleges. But what then will be the position of those of our ministers so physically constituted that they know not the difference between the "Old Hundred" and "God save the Queen"?

or "Rule Britannia"? Perhaps, however, Mr. Knowles only meant to assert that the minister is and ought to be the selector of the hymns and psalms used.

5. *The Duty of Walking worthy of the Lord: a Farewell Sermon preached in the New Meeting-house, Kidderminster, on Sunday, July 30, 1854.* By Rev. M. Gibson. Printed by Request.

THIS "parting exhortation" is simple, practical and beautifully affectionate,—an address which a good pastor could not deliver without deep feeling, and which an attached flock could not hear without emotion. We hope Mr. Gibson's services will soon be required in some other part of his Lord's vineyard.

6. *A Voice from the Parting Hour: a Farewell Discourse delivered before the Aberdeen Unitarian Congregation, on the 1st of January, 1854.* By Rev. D. Griffith.

THIS is a thoughtful, able and judicious discourse, delivered by the late minister of Aberdeen on the occasion of his departure to a new scene of usefulness, Newbury. It is more doctrinal than the discourse just noticed. Mr. Griffith is a zealous Unitarian; but he values Unitarianism because it is to his mind the best exponent of Christianity. His views will, we believe, find a response in the minds of the mass of the Unitarian body in England.

---

*What is Truth?* Pp. 124. London—John Chapman. 1854.

THIS volume consists of "casually preserved fragments of desultory correspondence" on the subject of the Evidences of Christianity. The writer is very far gone in infidelity, and reproaches Parker, Foxton, Froude and Newman, with not "honestly seizing and boldly proclaiming" the truth which they so nearly approach (p. 108). He does not deny the authenticity of the Scriptures, Old or New, but takes the bolder position of impugning their purity and value. We have looked through his pages, and have not discovered a single objection to the Jewish or Christian Scriptures which is not to be found in the coarsest Deistical writers of the last century. Our author's parenthetical, involved, and sometimes very inaccurate style, gives obscurity to what in Paine's "Age of Reason" is palpable enough. We feel little inclination to discuss with an author like this the question of Divine Revelation. At p. 101, he says, "There can be no question that 'gratuitously' to put forward offensive opinions is wholly indefensible." But that we will not pain our readers by quoting some of the more offensive passages, we might easily shew that the writer of "What is Truth?" is "wholly indefensible." If he asks for an illustration of our meaning, we point him to the offensive passage in which he speaks of "an operative Potter delighting in the praises of his own pots, fruitful in expedient and subterfuge, surrounded by adulatory hosts," &c. If the quarter whence this book proceeds justified the idea, we should almost suppose that it was put out to discredit infidelity, by shewing how feeble are its arguments, and how coarse and bad its spirit may be.

## INTELLIGENCE.

LORD BROUGHAM'S RECENT SPEECH ON  
EDUCATION.

[We have much pleasure in transferring to our pages, from a pamphlet just published by Ridgway, entitled, "Lord Brougham's Speeches upon National Education, House of Lords, 24th July and 4th August, 1854," a portion of the speech of his Lordship referred to in our first article (p. 593). That noble Lords should trip when they wander into the regions of theology and ecclesiastical history, is not surprising. Lord Brougham was in error in ranking Sir Matthew Hale with the Unitarians. He probably was thinking of the ever-memorable John Hales of Eton, who has sometimes been called a Socinian. Lord Campbell was very rash in his attempted correction of Lord Brougham. Sir Isaac Newton was no Arian. Hop-ton Haynes tells us that it was a saying of Sir Isaac to himself, "The time will come when the doctrine of the incarnation, as commonly received, shall be exploded as an absurdity equal to transubstantiation." On the same authority it is averred that "Sir Isaac Newton did not believe our Lord's pre-existence, being a Socinian, as we call it, in that article."—ED. C. R.]

In a community like this, filled with various religious classes, and whose religious zeal is happily so fervent—I say happily, because whatever dissensions it may engender, and whatever difficulties it may occasion, its warmth at least proves the strength and sincerity of religious conviction—it has always appeared nearly impossible to plant schools in which the children of various sects may be taught, unless their instruction is confined to secular learning, while their religious teaching is left to their parents or their pastors. But this principle by no means excludes whatever security may be required for their receiving that instruction at home, and for their attending the church to which their parents resort, supposing their attendance at the school service or school church dispensed with. This is the opinion, and with this qualification rather than exception, which I have ever held, and in common with men whose great worth was not more remarkable than the strength of their religious feelings, so that it is grounded on anything rather than indifference on this most important matter. I refer to

my lamented friend the late Duke of Bedford; but I may besides cite those who also bore the foremost part in the kindred, nay, identical controversy of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Whitbread, Zachary Macaulay, William Smith, who, differing with them on many other points, agreed on this, and agreed with them also in being a truly pious man.

At first, and I may add for very many years after the system of schools for all was introduced, it was no part of the plan that any care should be taken for religious instruction, because the difficulties were found to be all but insuperable, of combining that with secular teaching; and it was found almost equally difficult to exact any security for religious instruction out of school, unless some such instruction should be connected with the school teaching. Still, as the extreme importance of obtaining some such security was admitted on all hands, I was induced to insert a provision in the Bills of 1837, 1838 and 1839, which had received the entire approval and support of the Government (Lord Melbourne's), and I have introduced it into the Bill now on your table. It requires that all schools to be either planted or assisted by the rate which the municipal bodies are authorized to levy, shall be open to all classes, teaching no catechism, compelling no attendance at Church service, where parents either object to the catechism or the service, but requiring satisfactory proof that the religious instruction and attendance on divine service is cared for by the parents or guardians in their own way. When we consider the division of the community into so many sects, we at once perceive the absolute necessity of some such principle governing our provisions for popular education, if, indeed, we are not led at once the full length of adopting the peremptory separation of secular from religious instruction—on which, however, I repeat, the general sense of the country, and of Dissenters as well as Churchmen, has pronounced a sentence of condemnation.

But the religious divisions to which I advert are well calculated to make us feel all the difficulty of combining the two kinds of instruction in one system. On one side we have the Establishment and its schools, where the Catechism is taught, the Liturgy used, and attend-



ance on the Church service required; and here there is no difficulty, because the hundreds of thousands of children attending these schools, and answering to the millions of Churchmen, belong to one body, all professing a religious belief which is one and the same. So it is sometimes said, there being the Dissenters on the other hand,—let schools be provided for their children where no Church Catechism, Liturgy, or attendance is required, but the instruction is given according to their Dissenting views. And nothing could be more easy than such an arrangement if the sects, like the Church, were one and the same; but unfortunately they are five-and-thirty, twenty-seven British and eight foreign; there are divisions and sub-divisions: thus, when we speak of Methodists as a sect, we are speaking of nine sects; for there are the two great divisions of Arminian and Calvinistic, and the Arminians are subdivided into seven, the Calvinists into two. So the Baptists are five sects, not one; and thus, when we speak of Methodists and Baptists as if they were two sects, we in fact are speaking of no less than fourteen, which, with the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, the Independents, the Unitarians, and others, make in all five-and-thirty different persuasions.\* True, some of these sub-divisions only differ from each other by slight variations, or shades of diversity in opinion; and hence, if we had no experience to guide us, we might infer that their repugnance to each other, their determination to keep aloof, their mutual repulsion, as it were, would be feeble in the like proportion. But, alas! alas! it is just the other way. The nearer they approach in doctrine and discipline, the wider is their severance in feeling; the more alike their religious belief and political structure, the more they disagree, the greater is their mutual repugnance. It seems to be the law that governs religious dissensions and spiritual animosity. The *odium theologicum* seems, like gravitation, only that it is repulsive and not attractive, to act inversely as the distance, or even in a higher proportion to the proximity of faith. To establish anything like a common action among the zealots of these sects, is manifestly impossible. Nothing could satisfy, or

indeed appease them, but the establishment of schools for each of the different persuasions,—a thing utterly impracticable.

Happily, however, the same spirit does not prevail in all the denominations, or at least among all the members of each. There is the most satisfactory evidence that a great proportion of Dissenters avail themselves of the instruction afforded by the Church schools, and it is probable that far more of each sect send their children thither than to other Dissenting seminaries. If we take the census returns framed upon the Church attendance on the 31st March, 1851, we may reckon 8,000,000 as the number of persons belonging to the Establishment; 5,700,000 as those of all the 35 sects; leaving about 4,200,000 not professing to join with any denomination. It has no doubt been said that those returns are of questionable accuracy as regards the proportion of Churchmen to Dissenters, and a Right Rev. friend of mine (Bishop of Oxford) lately adduced facts to illustrate this position. But admitting all that can be alleged in support of this argument, the estimate of the number of Dissenters on which I am grounding my inference, will not be affected, because there is the margin of 4,200,000 to be distributed; and it must be granted that a certain proportion of these belong to the sects. I will allow by far the greater number to the Church; but I think, were my Right Rev. friend here, he would admit that increasing the number of 8,000,000, shewn by the returns, to the extent of 9,000,000, and diminishing by that addition the 5,000,000 of Dissenters, we cannot add the whole 4,200,000 to the Church, giving it above 13,000,000. It is manifest, therefore, that nearer six than five millions must belong to the sects, or about 5,700,000. Now, in this population, what is the proportion of children attending schools? By the statements which I made the other evening, and for the reasons then urged, it appears that there should be about 700,000. But the returns don't shew above 240,000 attending the Dissenting schools, leaving more than 450,000 who must receive their education elsewhere. The great desire of Dissenters to obtain instruction for their children is undeniable; it has at all times most honourably distinguished them. They were the earliest in the field as promoters of popular education; and the number of children which I have just stated must

\* There are two or three more, but so small in numbers as not to require notice. Thus the Seventh-Day Baptists have only 52, the Italian Reformers 20.

therefore receive education either at private seminaries or at church schools. At private seminaries, it is evident that only the children of the wealthier classes can be taught; and as these attend schools much longer than others, there must on that account be an addition made to the number which was taken upon the general average for all classes. So that nearly the whole 450,000, certainly 400,000, are to be regarded as attending the National or Church schools. This is a fact of the greatest importance, and it is hard to say whether there results from it more credit to the wise liberality of the Church or of the sects; for it shews, on the one hand, that generally speaking no attendance or instruction is enforced which can offend conscientious scruples on matters of importance; and it proves, on the other hand, that the mere name of the establishment, and the connection with it of the patrons and teachers, does not raise a prejudice sufficient to outweigh the Dissenter's desire of education for his child. We may thus derive very great comfort from observing that the good sense of the greater number both among Churchmen and sectaries, prevails over the bigoted violence of zealots, leads the one class to keep open the doors of their schools to all, by forbidding any compulsion either as to catechism or divine service, and keeps the other class above the folly of indulging in groundless prejudices, rather against the name of an establishment than its substance.

But upon this wise forbearance, as the cardinal point, hinges the power of that establishment to benefit those without its pale. Its schools can only be accessible to all by the exclusion of whatever shuts their doors against conscientious Dissenters. Yet it is lamentable to reflect that, while the Church has thus distinguished itself, those who had originally taken the lead against all exclusive views, all dogmatic tests, all observances which could by possibility introduce disqualification on religious grounds, have lately departed widely from these wise and tolerant principles. With the British and Foreign School Society, I have been intimately acquainted, I may say connected, from its commencement, in 1810, under another name. Indeed, I presided at the preliminary meeting held to found it, attended by W. Allen, Joseph Fox, Thomas Clarkson and others, who had stood by Joseph Lancaster in his great

difficulties. In the following spring, the Duke of Bedford presided over its first public meeting. Under his auspices, and those of the Duke of Kent, father of Her Majesty, one of the most zealous and useful friends of the institution, it gathered strength; and its fundamental principle, that which distinguished it from the National Society soon after established, was the rigorous exclusion of all differences on religious grounds, the severance of secular from religious instruction, the repudiation of whatever could by any possibility operate as a test—the principle embodied in its motto of *Schools for All*. Judge, then, of my astonishment when I lately heard that steps had been taken to shut the doors of this institution against Unitarians, and deprive them of its benefits by requiring the acceptance of religious dogmas to which they cannot assent. Among the sects to which I have adverted, the Unitarians are in point of numbers nearly the least conspicuous; they amount to little more than 60,000; but they are for the most part in easy circumstances, and for their character and habits much respected. They make great exertions for the education of their children; but their poor, though not numerous, are in want of the means of instruction, especially in some parts of the West of England. Applying to the teachers connected with the Society and its officers, the pastors of the Unitarians have found that in its schools religious doctrines are required to be taught to which no conscientious Unitarian can subscribe. To such an extent has this departure from its fundamental principles proceeded, that I hold in my hand the opinion given by two learned friends of mine, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas when he was Attorney-General, and Mr. Rolt, the eminent King's Counsel, who being consulted upon the statement of the Society itself, signed by its Secretary, pronounced without hesitation that the Society is guilty of a constant breach of trust in dealing with the funds given or bequeathed to it on the faith of its original or fundamental principles, but now applied to support schools from whence Unitarians are excluded by the religious dogmas taught, by the test thus exacted from teachers, the standard of supposed orthodoxy to which the scholar must conform; and this by the Society which plumes itself upon rejecting all manner of exclusion, arrogates to itself the peculiar function of holding schools

for all, and is constituted, both in its patrons and in its members, most chiefly of Dissenters from the National Church. So much for the tolerance of those who charge the Church with exclusive principles; so much for the fancy that intolerance is confined to establishments.

I have heard it once and again affirmed that Unitarians are not Christians; and some, in their unreflecting zeal—some even of those whom I sincerely respect—have gone so far as to call Socinianism a half-way house towards infidelity; forgetting that a half-way house, from the nature of the thing, *ex vi termini*, must be as well from as towards,—either to infidelity, or from infidelity to Christianity; and, accordingly, I have known eminent converts from the superstitions of the East who were Socinians. But when misguided men of more zeal than knowledge would thus distinguish the Unitarian from the Christian, whom, I will ask, do we fondly cite as our highest authorities when we are engaged in defending our religion against its infidel adversaries? In arguing with these upon the evidences, how often has one said, "What better would you have than that which satisfied the greatest masters of science, the great luminaries of law? Who was ever a better judge of legal evidence than Hale, of moral evidence than Locke, of mathematical and physical evidence than Newton?" And yet Locke at one time laboured under grave suspicion of Unitarianism, groundless, perhaps, though he was at the least an Arian. But that Newton was a Unitarian, is quite certain. (*Lord Campbell expressed some dissent, saying he was an Arian.*) No—as thorough a Unitarian as ever attended Essex-Street chapel. My noble and learned friend will find this clearly proved by Sir D. Brewster from examination of the Newton MSS., which that learned person says leave not the shadow of a doubt upon the subject. Your Lordships, indeed, are not Unitarians; I question if there be one in this House. (*Lord C. "There have been."*) Certainly there have; the Duke of Grafton and others. With them we may not agree; but assuredly their errors are not to be corrected by denying that Sir Isaac Newton was a Christian, or Dr. Lardner—he to whose writings the defence of our religion owes so great an obligation, that they form a large proportion, nay, the very foundation of Dr. Paley's celebrated work. With these eminent men you

may differ; you may keep aloof as wide as you will from them; but it is not by denying the Christianity of Newton and Lardner that you can turn Socinians aside from their track. Neither of their heresies nor of far greater than theirs, have I the least dread. I have no alarm for the truth—no fear of error. Let truth be left to the attacks of its enemies, error to the care of its friends, and I have no apprehension of the result. But one thing I do fear; one thing does alarm me; and that is persecuted error. That fills me with apprehension; for well I know that whether openly persecuted or secretly oppressed—cruelly treated or subjected to injustice, annoyance and vexation—it straightway becomes formidable. Maltreatment gives it the only chance of success, makes it by degrees wear the garb of truth, and end by usurping her place. I hope and trust that the notice taken of that grievous mistake into which the men I allude to have been betrayed—well-meaning men, but over zealous, and without knowledge to temper and guide their zeal—may lead them to regain the right path from which they have strayed, to correct the abuse which they have countenanced.

Lord CAMPBELL merely rose to express his disapproval of the manner in which, as his noble and learned friend had said, the Unitarians had been persecuted. He (Lord Campbell) was not aware that Sir Isaac Newton was a Socinian; he had always believed him to have been an Arian; he believed, however, that the Socinians numbered among themselves many men of good education, of great attainments, and of irreproachable lives. Though this sect laboured under what he conceived to be a lamentable error, still they were Christians, and ought to be treated as such. Until the repeal of the statutes of William III., Socinians had laboured under various disabilities, and were not entitled to all the privileges of the Act of Uniformity, but now they were placed on the same footing as the other religious sects; and though hoping that they might see their error, he yet trusted that, while they continued in their error, they would be treated as Christian brethren, and not, as they had been, as something worse than infidels.

---

#### SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The fifty-third annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society was



held at Poole on Wednesday, Sept. 13. The Rev. D. Griffith, of Wareham, introduced the service in the morning, and the Rev. W. J. Odgers preached an impressive and appropriate sermon from 2 Chron. xxxi. 21, on the position and duties of Unitarian Christians. He shewed that Unitarians came to occupy their present position, not from any cherished love of exclusiveness, but from acting consistently on the great principles of the Protestant Reformation, and from their desire to maintain and profess "the faith once delivered to the saints." As a further motive to this duty, the preacher considered some of the *evils* which exist in consequence of *not* knowing and appreciating the Unitarian faith, and some of the *positive benefits* which it has power to confer. In conclusion, he powerfully enforced the need of earnestness, union, charity and piety. In the evening, the Rev. E. Kell conducted the devotional service, and the Rev. W. J. Odgers delivered an animating discourse from Isaiah xxxv. 1, on the renovating influences of Christianity, and the obligation resting on Christians of all sects and churches to apply it more extensively as the heaven-sent remedy for the worst ills of human life. After the morning service, the business of the Society was conducted in the chapel, the whole congregation marking their interest by remaining during the proceedings. The Rev. Mark Rowntree occupied the chair, and the Rev. E. Kell, the Secretary, read the report, which gave a favourable account of the state of the Society. It dwelt much on the growing use of such societies, consequent on the enlarged power of reading among the masses,—a power which makes an urgent call on the Christian to disseminate by means of the press such works as would tend to open the mind to the pure, uncorrupted teaching of the great Messiah. The report was adopted, on the motion of the Rev. D. Griffiths, seconded by Thomas Naish, Esq.; and cordial thanks were presented to the preacher for his excellent sermon, on the motion of John Brown, Esq., of Wareham, seconded by the Rev. John Porter.

The Rev. W. J. Odgers moved, and Edward Dixon, Esq., of Southampton, and A. Balston, Esq., supported the resolution, "That the members of this Society, whilst sincerely thankful for the Act which has recently passed the Legislature, granting admission to the University of Oxford without subscrip-

tion to any test or creed, desire to express their fervent gratitude to all who promoted that important measure, but more especially to James Heywood, Esq., M.P., for his most judicious and untiring exertions, to which its ultimate success is mainly to be attributed."

It was proposed by the Rev. D. Griffiths, seconded by the Rev. E. Kell, "That this Society begs to express its sympathy with the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, in its efforts for carrying out the important objects comprised in its address to the Christian public, for 'preparing men of earnest and devout minds to be domestic missionaries, Unitarian missionaries, and ministers to rural and other small congregations;' and further to express its confidence in the ability and judgment of the Rev. Dr. Beard and the Rev. W. Gaskell, as the instructors of the students admitted to that institution."

It was moved by the Rev. E. Kell, seconded by the Rev. Joseph Darby, "That this meeting rejoices in the progress which enlightened opinions on the subject of religious liberty have made in the Legislature in the course of the past session, more especially with regard to the abolition of Church Rates, and desires to express its thanks to Sir W. Clay and the large minority of 182 members by whom his motion for their total abolition was so nearly carried."

After other routine resolutions had been passed, about thirty members and friends dined together at the London Tavern, Edward Dixon, Esq., occupying the chair, and Freeland Filliter, Esq., being vice-president. The company was afterwards augmented by the presence of ladies. Many animated addresses were delivered by the ministers and gentlemen before mentioned, for which we regret we have no space. There was no sentiment more cordially responded to than that which expressed interest in the prosperity of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, which promises so well to supply a felt want of ministers in our churches. Though the weather was unfavourable, the attendance at the services of the chapel was good, especially in the evening. A distribution of the Society's tracts was made at the doors. It was not to be expected that great things could be accomplished at this meeting, yet were the objects of the Society well supported; nor can the harmonious gathering of Christian brotherhoods be unattended with good; it strengthens the Christian for action.

## SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEA-PARTY.

On the evening of Saturday, Sept. 23rd, the directors and teachers of the Sunday-school connected with the Old chapel, Dukinfield, held their annual tea-party for old scholars and the parents of present scholars. About 400 persons assembled at five o'clock in the large school-room; a very large proportion of the assembled guests consisted of the parents, especially the mothers, of children now in the schools; many of these parents were also old scholars. There were many friendly greetings between teachers and scholars of former years. One matron present said that her children now receiving instruction in the school, were the fourth generation in her family who had been connected with the institution. The neatness and comfortable appearance of the assembly, composed almost entirely of persons in the humble ranks of society, was remarked on as a pleasing proof of the prosperity of the district, and of the orderly domestic habits of the class of persons for whose benefit the schools are designed. After a comfortable and inexpensive meal, which was served without bustle or confusion, the chair was taken by the minister of the Old chapel, who began the proceedings by giving out James Montgomery's fine jubilee hymn for Sunday-schools. He then addressed to the parents assembled a number of plain, practical counsels, shewing them how they could best co-operate with the teachers, and make the instruction communicated effectual to the improvement and respectability of their children.

Mr. Curtis, of Manchester, followed in an impressive address on the duties of home and on other kindred and appropriate subjects. Mr. Freestone, of Manchester, also addressed the assembly, and while expressing his admiration of the combined object the managers of the school had in view, recommended them to aim in future at an annual party for old scholars, distinct from that to which parents were invited. Independently of the good which he said must result from such friendly gatherings, ministering to kind social feelings and to intellectual and religious cultivation, it would be well to keep up and renew, by systematic intercourse, the bonds between the teachers and their old pupils, and between one generation and another of Sunday scholars. Mr. Whittaker, the senior director of the schools, said the recommendations should be taken into consideration, and with affectionate warmth commended the indefatigable zeal of the present teachers. Never had the schools been so regularly and effectually managed, and never in his recollection was there a more religious spirit in the minds of the teachers, or a closer union between the schools and the chapel. The addresses were interspersed with music, chiefly sacred, sung with considerable taste by a class for vocal music, raised and conducted by the teachers. After singing the evening hymn and a prayer from the minister, the assembly broke up at nine o'clock, much gratified with the practical and amiable, though unpretending, proceedings of the evening.

## MARRIAGES.

July 13, at the Unitarian chapel, Bridport, by Rev. John L. Short, Mr. WILLIAM EDWARDS to MARY ANNE YOUNG, both of Bridport.

July 25, at the parish church of Godley-cum-Newton-Green, by Rev. R. K. Bateson, incumbent, assisted by Rev. A. Read, incumbent of St. George's church, Hyde, RANDALL HIBBERT, third son of the late John ALCOCK, Esq., of Gatley Hill, to JANE, second daughter of John TURNER, Esq., of Godley.

July 27, at the Unitarian chapel, Brixton, by Rev. C. C. Coe, J. W. COE, Esq., of Peoria, Illinois, U.S., to ANNE, third daughter of Rev. W. SELBY, of Hapton, Norfolk.

Aug. 9, at Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. W. Gaskell, PETER ALLEN, Esq., of Manchester, to SOPHIA RUSSELL, eldest daughter of the late John Edward TAYLOR, Esq., of Manchester.

Aug. 15, at the Unitarian chapel, Effra Road, Brixton, by Rev. Samuel Bache, of Birmingham, ALFRED WILLS, Esq., of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to LUCY, youngest daughter of George MARTINEAU, Esq., of Tulse Hill.

Aug. 29, at Edinburgh, by Rev. John Gordon, Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP, of Liverpool, to MARGARET, third daughter of Edward John MAUGHAN, Esq., of Edinburgh.



## OBITUARY.

July 1, at his residence, Ansty-Frith House, near Leicester, SAMUEL KIRBY, Esq., aged 66. He was one of a numerous family, and was born at Ibstock, in the same county. He was for many years a partner in the bank of Messrs. Paget and Kirby, Leicester. He was universally esteemed for his obliging disposition, strict integrity, and honourable conduct in every relation of life. He was a Unitarian in his religious opinions, and a constant attendant at the services of the Great Meeting, Leicester, under the pastoral care of the Rev. Charles Berry. He was singularly retiring and amiable in his character and manners, and his death is lamented by a numerous circle of friends and acquaintance. To his surviving family his loss is irreparable.

July 18, at Dorking, Miss ANNE TINGCOMBE, of Hyde Vale, Greenwich, formerly of Plymouth, aged 68.

This excellent woman deserves a notice in the pages of this work, devoted to the principles she was so much attached to;—she, and a family, and line of ancestors from the time of Nathaniel Tingcombe, one of the Two Thousand ministers ejected by the Act of Uniformity. Nor was she the less entitled to the distinction by her own merit. She was of a sweet and cheerful temper, complete unselfishness and self-sacrifice, benevolent disposition and unaffected piety; and though afflicted for many years with lameness, she never spared herself on errands of duty, or visits of sympathy or charity, or in her attendance on religious services; and to do good and make others happy, was her constant aim. Her remains rest in the vault of a near and intimate friend, who is pleased thus shortly to commemorate her worth.

W. W.

Aug. 4, suddenly, at Mackenzie Place, Sheffield, aged 22, ANN ELIZABETH, the beloved and only daughter of Rev. Peter WRIGHT, minister of the Unitarian chapel, Stannington.

We deeply regret to add to this announcement the recent death of Rev. PETER WRIGHT himself. We trust we shall be supplied by some Sheffield correspondent with an obituary memoir of this worthy man.

Aug. 12, in his 72nd year, S. SHAEN,

Esq., of Crix, in the county of Essex, suddenly, from disease of the heart. He was for many years an active and useful magistrate for the county, and in the midst of the Toryism in Church and State for which the Essex gentry are so remarkable, cherished his Dissenting and liberal principles with uncompromising faithfulness. He became a Unitarian early in life, and was guided and supported by the pure and scriptural views he had held at no little sacrifice, to the last hour of his honoured life.

August 12, at Newbury, Berks, aged 73, Mr. WM. W. KIMBER. From his earliest to his latest years, he was a respected and constant worshiper in the Presbyterian chapel, in the burial-ground of which he was interred by the Rev. E. Kell. Surely it may be said of him, he fell asleep in humble and joyful hope of a resurrection unto eternal life.

August 24, near Varna, of cholera, Captain GEORGE DUCKWORTH, of the 5th Dragoon Guards, aged 28, eldest son of William Duckworth, Esq., of Beechwood, New Forest, Hants.

Sept. 10, at Honiton, after a lingering and painful illness of four months, JANE, the affectionate wife of Mr. John MURCH, and third daughter of the late Mr. S. Stevens, of Bridport. In her, the congregation of this town has lost one of its most zealous supporters and regular attendants; feeling it a duty, she frequently was present when her health did not permit, being anxious to make one more of a small congregation.

From early life she evinced a great love for the cause of religious truth, being always active and useful in instructing the young, attending class-meetings and other institutions connected with the flourishing society in her native town. On her removal to Honiton in the year 1838, she became a member of a large family; and from her kindness of heart and hospitable welcome to all, she won their affectionate regard, and will long be remembered by those who had the pleasure of her acquaintance. She had no children, but she leaves a husband and sisters, and many nephews and nieces, who deeply deplore her loss.

Honiton, Sept. 17th, 1854.